281.9B
H78s

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

Society for Promoting Religion
and Learning

D & T DEPT. DEC 23 81

STUDENT'S HISTORY

OF

THE GREEK CHURCH.

STUDENT'S HISTORY

OF

THE GREEK CHURCH.

BY THE

REV. A. H. HORE, M.A.,

Trinity College, Oxford.

Author of "Eighteen Centuries of the Church in England,"
"Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church,"
"History of the Church Catholic,"
"History of the Church of England for Schools and Families," &c.

Dedicated (by permission) to the Tsar of Russia.

JAMES PARKER AND CO.

31 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND, LONDON;

AND 27 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

NEW YORK: E. & J. B. YOUNG & CO.

7 AND 9 WEST EIGHTEENTH STREET.

1902.

37651

281.9Q
H78s

PREFACE.

I WROTE this book for my own edification, for circulation amongst my friends, and those who interest themselves in the Greek Church; and publish it under strong pressure, some people thinking it may be useful in increasing the friendly relations which exist between Russia and England, and the Greek and Anglican Churches. But it is not encouraging to be told beforehand that, in certain quarters, a history of the Greek Church is sure to be condemned. The truth of this I experienced from the *Athenæum*, in its treatment of my *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church.*

I have before me a Review which attributes to a leading member of the Greek Church the saying, that my "Eighteen Centuries" had done more for the Reunion of Christendom than anything which has as yet been done or written; yet the *Athenæum* had not a word but dispraise of it, from beginning to end. It is one thing to be learned in the civil and political history of nations, another to understand and appreciate their ecclesiastical history.

The present book being intended for Students, I did not think it necessary to commence it before the Council of Nicæa. For the same reason (although my space could ill afford it), I have made copious footnotes, with references to, that authority of authorities, the Fathers; in the hope that students may be induced to make further search themselves. My references are generally

to the Oxford and American Edition of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers; and, as my book is necessarily concerned mostly with the latter, I sometimes use the abbreviation P.N.F.

I do not claim credit to myself, in an ecclesiastical sense, for writing this book. I do not even rank myself amongst High Churchmen, who are generally considered the staunchest allies of the Greek Church; nor do I consider myself bound, in external matters, to things, which might have been good eighteen hundred years ago, but may have ceased to be so now. It is the duty of an historian to register facts, not his own opinions; I have found history, whenever the two Churches clash, to be on the Greek, not the Roman, side. The reunion of Christendom, and, as a step towards it, the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches, is what Christians of all denominations must desire, because it would be the fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer that they should be one; but I think the other branches of Christendom have more to learn from the simple Catholic system of the Church of England, than we have from them.

My object is chiefly political; to take my share in making Russia and England friends, as they ought to be, and as they might be; the love of Russians for their Church is what English people do not realize; and the heart of Russia is to be touched through the union of the Anglican and Greek Churches. Nothing more horrible can be imagined, than a war between Russia, now ruled over by the peace-loving son of a peace-loving father, with her huge battalions, and England, who has just emerged from a war which has cost her more than two hundred and thirty millions sterling, without any one, apparently, from a financial point of view, being affected

by it. In fact, within a week of the declaration of peace, the Prime Minister was able, on the highest authority, to state in the House of Lords, that our recent monetary expenditure, large as it was, so far from impairing, has "strengthened the financial condition of the Country."

I thoroughly agree in the sentiment expressed by Mme. Novikof[a]. In a chapter devoted to the Heirs of the Sick Man, she suggests that neither Russia, Austria, nor England should gain territory, on the dissolution of Turkey; and she urges the plea that "the traditional policy of Russia" is alliance with England; adding the melancholy reflexion—if only England will be friends. That is the sentiment of a true daughter of the Greco-Russian Church.

[a] *Russia and England from 1876 to 1880;* by O.K.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Some Characteristics of the Greek Church.

THE five Patriarchates of Christendom—The Independent Greek Churches—The Orthodox, the oldest, Church—Greek, the original language of the Church—The First Council of Constantinople and the Council of Chalcedon—*The Holy Governing Synod*—The higher clergy not allowed to marry—Mount Athos—The *Black* and *White* Clergy—Greek and Greco-Russian Churches—The different parts of a Greek Church—The Gates—The Altar—The Iconostasis—The Soleas—The Antimensia—The Bema; Prothesis; Σκευοφυλάκιον—Only one chapel—No instrumental singing—Church Bells forbidden in Turkey—Vestments—Great Seasons—Service-Books—The Canonical Hours—The three Liturgies—The Lents—The Seven Mysteries—Re-baptizing converts—The Roman withdrawal of the Cup in the Eucharist—The word Μετουσίωσις—Latinism in the Greek Church—*Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogila—*Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem*—Reformation of Peter the Great—The Metropolitans Plato and Philaret—The "*Orthodox Doctrine*" of Plato—*The Catechism* of Philaret—The Prosphers—The Three Oblations—The Eucharist—The Antidoron—Degrees of affinity—The Coronation in marriage.

pp. 1—28

PART I.

THE PATRIARCHATES OF CONSTANTINOPLE, ALEXANDRIA, ANTIOCH, AND JERUSALEM.

CHAPTER I.

The Nicene Creed enacted.

ARIUS—Alexander, Archbishop of Alexandria—Hosius—First Council of Nicæa—The Homo-ousion—The Nicene Creed—Arians banished—Time for observing Easter—The Meletian schism—Canons of Nicæa—Marriage of the Clergy—Constantine's *Vicennalia*—St. Helena's visit to the Holy Land—St. Athanasius, Archbishop—The Eusebians—Post-Nicene controversy—Eustathian schism at Antioch—Commencement of attacks on Athanasius—Constantine's *Tricennalia*—Council of Tyre—Athanasius at Constantinople; banished to Treves—Death of Arius—Of Constantine—Paul, bishop of Constantinople; banished for the first time; for the second time—The hermit Antony at Alexandria—Athanasius returns from banishment—Athanasius deprived, and Gregory of Cappadocia appointed—Athanasius goes to Rome—Pope Julius—Council at Rome—Council *in Encæniis*—*The Dedication Creed*—Acacius of Cæsarea—Paul restored—Banished the third time—Council of Sardica; of Philippopolis—*The Macrostich*—Return of Athanasius—*The Golden Period*—St. Cyril of Jerusalem—Marcellus of Ancyra, and his pupil Photinus—Liberius, Pope of Rome—Council of Arles—Of Milan—Banishment of Hosius and Liberius, and other bishops . pp. 29—65

CHAPTER II.

The Church's Victory over Arianism.

ATHANASIUS' third exile—George of Cappadocia—Frumentius, first bishop of Axum—Eudoxius, Archbishop of Antioch—Cyril of Jerusalem banished—Suppression of the Nicene Creed—Arian divisions—Second Council of Sirmium—"The Blasphemy of Sirmium"—Fall of Hosius—Synod of Ancyra—Third Council of Sirmium—Fall of Liberius—Councils of Rimini and Seleucia—Creed of Nikè-Rimini—Cyril of Jerusalem restored—Council of Constantinople of 360—Cyril again banished—Eudoxius appointed to Constantinople—Macedonius banished—St. Sophia's at Constantinople dedicated—Meletius, Archbishop of Antioch—Banished—Julian tries to re-introduce Paganism—Athanasius returns—Important Synod at Alexandria—Lucifer of Cagliari—Paulinus of Antioch—The Luciferians—Athanasius banished for the fourth time—Returns under Jovian—Council of Lampsacus—Fifth banishment of Athanasius—Acacius of Cæsarea and Cyril of Jerusalem—Return and death of Athanasius—Succeeded by Peter II.—Banished—St. Jerome at Bethlehem—"The Three Cappadocians"—Account of St. Basil—Gregory Nazianzen—Gregory of Nyssa—The Ecclesiastical following the Civil arrangement of the Roman Empire—Anthimus of Tyana—Battle of Hadrianople—The death-blow given to Arianism . . . . . pp. 66—89

CHAPTER III.

The Nicene Creed Re-affirmed.

GRATIAN and Theodosius, Emperors—The former refuses title of Pontifex Maximus—Death of St. Basil—Gregory Nazianzen goes to Constantinople—St. Jerome, his pupil—Maximus the Cynic—The heresy of Macedonius—Theodosius summons the second Œcumenical Council—Attended only by Eastern bishops—The Macedonian bishops leave the Council—Death of Meletius—Flavian Archbishop of Antioch—Gregory Nazianzen resigns bishopric of Constantinople—Nectarius elected—The Nicene Creed re-affirmed—*The Ancoratus* of St. Epiphanius—The added clauses of the Creed—Four Canons enacted—The heresy of Apollinaris—Importance of Canon III.—Old and New Rome—Alexandria, the highest see—Timothy of Alexandria—Council of Aquileia—Second and third Councils of Constantinople—Discontent of the Arians—Intolerance of Gratian and Theodosius—Paganism ceases to be the established religion of the Roman Empire—Theophilus of Alexandria—Deaths of Gratian and Theodosius—"The Wandering of the Nations"—St. Chrysostom, Patriarch of Constantinople—State of the Church—Character of Chrysostom—The Empress Eudoxia—Origenist Controversy—Quarrel between Jerome and Rufinus—Athanasius' opinion of Origen—*The Tall Brothers*—Uncanonical conduct of St. Epiphanius—Council of the Oak—Condemns Chrysostom—Annulled by larger Council at Constantinople—Chrysostom banished to Cucusus—Removes to Arabissus—Returns to Cucusus—His death and burial at Comana

pp. 90—119

CHAPTER IV.

The Dyophysite and Monophysite Controversies.

THEODOSIUS II. and Pulcheria—Cyril of Alexandria—Death of St. Jerome—Why a Latin and not Greek Father—Philip of Side—Theodore of Mopsuestia—Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople—Theodoret's opinion of him—The Theotokos—Celestine of Rome—John of Antioch—Œcumenical Council of Ephesus—Nestorius condemned and banished—The Conciliabulum—Rabulas—The creed of Charisius. The Cypriot Church—Pelagians condemned—Reconciliation of the Antiochene and Alexandrian Churches—Proclus—The end of Nestorius—The Pelagians—Translation of the remains of St. Chrysostom—And of *the Forty Martyrs*—Chrysaphius—Dioscorus—Great eminence of Alexandria—Eutyches—Eusebius of Dorylæum—Flavian—Leo the Great—His *Tome*—*The Latrocinium*—Theodoret condemned—Brutal treatment of Flavian—The Latrocinium, a General Council—Marcian and Pulcheria—Council of Chalcedon—Recitation of the two forms of the Creed—Dioscorus condemned and deprived—Definition of the Council—Jerusalem raised to a Patriarchate—Ibas pronounced orthodox—Privileges given to Constantinople by canons IX., XVII. and XXVIII.—Julian, bishop of Cos—Canon XXVIII. objected to at Rome—Anger of Pope Leo—The great monophysite controversy—Troubles at Jerusalem—At Alexandria—Murder of St. Proterius—Timothy Ælurus—St. Simeon Stylites—Timothy Salophaciolus—Troubles at Antioch—Peter Fuller . . pp. 120—157

CHAPTER V.

The Government of the Church by Imperial Edicts.

FALL of the Western Empire—Zeno sole Emperor—The Arian Kings of Italy—Zeno deposed—The Encyclical of the usurper Basiliscus—Zeno restored. The Stylite Daniel—Death of Salophaciolus—Thalaia appointed to Alexandria—Deposed, and goes to Rome—Changes in the sees of Alexandria and Antioch—Zeno's *Henoticon*—The *Acephali*—Felix of Rome and Acacius of Constantinople excommunicate each other—Thirty-five years' schism between Constantinople and Rome—Danger of the Church from monophysitism—The Emperor Anastasius—The Patriarch Euphemius deposed—Macedonius appointed—Anastasius enforces the Henoticon—Severus—Riots at Constantinople—Anastasius in danger—Severus and Julian of Halicarnassus, the leaders of the monophysites—Xenaias—Severus appointed Patriarch of Antioch—The synod of Sidon—St. Euthymius—St. Sabas—Monophysite schism at Jerusalem ends—Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem—Theodoric—Arian, King of Italy, forces Anastasius to treat the Orthodox with justice—Eutychianism triumphant throughout the East—Justin I., Emperor—Severus and other monophysite leaders deprived—End of the schism—Followed by a schism in Roman Church—Election of the Pope decided by Theodoric—*Synodus Palmaris*—Justin yields to Pope Hormisdas—A dangerous precedent—Intolerant edict of Justin—Theodoric despatches Pope John I. to Rome—The Pope displeases Theodoric—Imprisoned at Ravenna—Dies

in prison—Earthquakes at Antioch—Count Ephraim—*Theopolis*—Justinian and Theodora—Pope Agapetus dies at Constantinople—Mennas, the Œcumenical Patriarch—Vigilius, Pope—Theodore Ascidas—St. Sabas at Constantinople—Dies—Origenist controversy—*The Three Chapters*—Edict against the Three Chapters—Vigilius summoned to Constantinople—His *Judicatum*—Second Œcumenical Council of Constantinople—The *Constitutum* of Vigilius—Council condemns the Three Chapters—Vigilius confirms its decrees—Allowed to return to Rome, but dies on the way—Schism in Roman Church—Justinian falls into the *Aphthardocetic* heresy—Re-building of St. Sophia's—Tritheism—John *the Faster*, and the title of Œcumenical Patriarch—Anger of Pope Gregory I. —Discovery of the seamless robe of Christ—The disgraceful reign of Phocas—The Persian war—Capture of Jerusalem—John *the Almoner*—Birth of Mahomet—Character of Mahometanism—The Koran—The Saracens—Queen Mavia—The Hegira—The Caliphs—Sonnites and Shiites—Jerusalem taken by Saracens—Sophronius—The Copts—Fall of the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria—Monothelitism—Sergius—Cyrus—The *One Theandric Operation*—Honorius, Pope of Rome—His heresy—Stephen of Dor—Pyrrhus—*The Ecthesis*—*The Type* —First Lateran council—Pope Martin I.—Pope Vitalian—St. Maximus—Third Œcumenical Council of Constantinople—Pope Agatho—Pope Leo II.—The Trullan Council—The Patriarch Callinicus—Pope Constantine . . . . . pp. 158—207

CHAPTER VI.

The Non-Orthodox Greek Churches.

THE schism in the Greek Church, as much political as ecclesiastical—Questionable how far the schismatical Churches were heretical—The Armenians not heretical—The Churches which separated after Ephesus and after Chalcedon—The Eastern Syrians claim St. Thaddæus as their Founder, and Mar Mari as their first Bishop—The school of Edessa—Ephrem Syrus—Rabulas—Ibas—His Letter to Maris—Barsumas—Nestorian Church separates from Patriarch of Antioch—Their *Catholicos* assumes title of Patriarch—Zeno suppresses School of Edessa—Great spread of Nestorianism in Persia—School of Nisibis—Nestorian missions —They remove their primatial see from Seleucia to Bagdad—Seemed likely to supersede the Orthodox Church—Their decay—Uniat Chaldæans —Mar Shimun—The *Mattran*, or Mar Knanishu—Nestorians of Persia and Turkey—Kurdish massacre—The "Assyrian Mission" from England—Bishop of Urmi at first Lambeth Conference—Russian mission—*Christians of St. Thomas*—St. Thomas, martyr at Meliapore—Bishop of India present at First Council of Nicæa—Embraced Nestorianism—Mission of King Alfred—Kings of the Christians of St. Thomas—Vasco di Gama—Alexis di Menexes—The Synod of Diamper—Roman bigotry drove them into Jacobitism—Uniat Church of Travancore—The Jacobites —Jacob Baradai—Claim to be next to Jerusalem the oldest Church—Their Patriarch always called Ignatius—The *Maphrian*—Xenaias honoured as a Confessor—Abulpharagius—The Copts—Driven into schism by intolerance—Hatred of Melchites—Their Patriarch at Cairo claims to

be the true successor of St. Mark—Their history from first to last one of disaster—The French occupation of Egypt—Under Mahomet Ali—Mode of conferring Orders—Uniat Copts—*The Association for the furtherance of Christianity in Egypt*—The El Tewfik Society—Nubia entirely unchristianized—Frumentius consecrated by St. Athanasius, first bishop of Abyssinia—Their *Abuna*—The *Kumos*—Their monks—Jesuits driven from the country—Prester John—Jewish customs—The Armenians next in importance to Orthodox Church—Converted by Gregory the Illuminator—Etchmiadzen—Their Church autocephalous—First National Church—SS. Isaac and Mesrob—Translation of the Bible—Persecution—See removed to Tovin—Opinion of Armenians of Council of Chalcedon—Synod of Vagarshabad rejected the Council; rejection renewed at Synod of Tovin—Never accepted Eutychianism—Not considered by the Orthodox Church monophysite—Their canonical Scriptures—The Armenians and Council of Florence—Protected by Peter the Great, and Catharine II.—Etchmiadzen, part of Russian Empire—Three Catholicoses—Titular Patriarchs—All subject to Catholicos of Etchmiadzen—Maronites sole remnant of Monothelitism—Changed to Romanism; but as Uniats . . . . . pp. 208—228

CHAPTER VII.

The Second Council of Nicæa.

GREEK Fathers on Images—Iconoclastic Controversy—Leo the Isaurian—His victory over the Saracens—Their opposition to image-cultus, of which they were not in a position to judge—Difference between Latin and Greek icons—The Council of Trullo, and icons—Reformation needed, but should have proceeded from the Church—The Patriarch Germanus—Leo's two edicts—Riots, and a terrible massacre—Germanus and Pope Gregory II. make common cause—Leo confiscates provinces of the Pope—Germanus resigns, and Anastasius, an iconoclast, appointed—John Damascene, and the Vizier—Pope Gregory III.—Constantine V., and Artavasdes—Anastasius becomes orthodox—His cruel treatment—Council of 754—Cultus of images condemned—The Patriarch Constantine II.—Pepin and his two sons anointed Kings of the Franks—Opposition of the monks—Persecution—The Patriarch banished—Paul IV., Patriarch—Resigns—St. Tarasius appointed—The Empress Irene summons Second Council of Nicæa—Held eight sessions, and passed twenty-two canons—Condemns the late Council—Pope Honorius condemned by the Council which the Roman Church holds as Œcumenical—The icons to receive ἀσπασμόν and προσκύνησιν, but not λατρείαν—The opponents of the icons anathematized—The canons of the Council—The Council the last of the Œcumenical Councils—Council of Frankfort—Repudiated degrees of the Council—Council of Paris—The Gallican Church—The Holy Roman Empire founded—Patriarch of Jerusalem sends to Charlemagne keys of the Holy Sepulchre—*The Forged Decretals*—Nicephorus, Patriarch—Deposed—His "History"—Theodore Studita—The Empress Theodora—Methodius, Patriarch of Constantinople—Victory of the Icons—Institution of the Κυριακὴ τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας . . pp. 229—252

CHAPTER VIII.

Photius and the Great Schism.

CHARACTER of Photius—Photius and Pope Nicolas I.—Ignatius—Gregory of Syracuse—Bardas—Photius appointed Patriarch of Constantinople—Pope Nicolas adds the Filioque to the Creed—Uses the Forged Decretals—Bardas' cruel treatment of Ignatius—The conversion of the Slavic nations—Cyril and Methodius—Martyrdom of St. Clement of Rome—The linguistic difficulty—Slavic translation of the Scriptures—Conversion of Moravia—Death of Cyril—Christianity in Bulgaria—The monk Cupharas—The Tsar Boris—Conversion of Bulgaria—Of Bohemia—Of Poland—Poland Latinized—Methodius accused before Pope John VIII.—Acquitted—Death of Methodius—The followers of Methodius, driven from Moravia, confirm the faith of Bulgaria—The Battle of Pressburg—Persecution of the dead Methodius by the Roman Church—Conversion of Russia—Synod at Constantinople in 862—The Encyclical of Photius—Photius deposed, and Ignatius restored—Synod at Constantinople in 869—Question of the *Procession*—Death of Ignatius—Photius restored—Pope John VIII.'s strong condemnation of the addition of the Filioque—Synod at Constantinople in 879—The Filioque condemned by Papal legates—Photius deposed by the Emperor—Dies in Exile—Fourth marriages declared unlawful—Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria—The Emperor Basil Bulgaroctonos—His victories over the Saracens—Michael Cerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople—Leo IX. Pope—Cerularius' letter to the Bishop of Trani—Cardinal Humbert—The crucial points—The final schism, after Leo's death—Humbert accuses the Greeks with expunging the Filioque from the Creed—Account of the addition—Deposition of Cerularius . . . . . pp. 253—286

CHAPTER IX.

The Crusades and the Fall of Constantinople.

THE Seljuks—The Battle of Manzikert—Capture of Jerusalem by Malek Shah—Persecution of the pilgrims to Jerusalem—Peter the Hermit—Pope Urban II.—Councils of Piacenza and Clermont—First Crusade—Jerusalem retaken—Kingdom of Jerusalem—The Knights Templars and Hospitallers—Second Crusade—Battle of Tiberias—Jerusalem taken by Saladin—Third Crusade—Richard Cœur de Lion takes Cyprus—Acre recovered by Crusaders—Fourth Crusade—Pope Innocent III.—Crusaders take and pillage Constantinople—Latin Empire set up, and Latin Patriarch—Fourth Lateran Council—Fifth Crusade—Frederic II. of Germany, "the Wonder of the world," thrice excommunicated—Sixth (an English) Crusade—Palestine recovered—Jerusalem taken by Corasmians—Seventh Crusade—Fall of Acre, the last possession of the Christians—The Crusades established the supremacy of the Popes—The Greek Kingdom of Nicæa—John Camateros, the Greek Patriarch, declining, Michael Autorianus appointed Patriarch—The Patriarch Germanus III.—Unsuccessful attempts at re-union—The meeting at Nymphæum—Arsenius, Patriarch—Marriage of the last Latin Emperor,

Baldwin II., with daughter of Charles of Anjou—Disgraceful state of the Latin Patriarchate at Constantinople—End of Latin Empire—Michael Palæologus—The Orthodox Church restored at Constantinople—Its hatred of the Latins—Michael excommunicated by Arsenius, who is deposed—Michael's intrigues with (1) Pope Urban IV.; (2) Clement IV.; (3) Gregory X.—Sham Union—Michael deposes the Patriarch Joseph, and appoints Veccus—Great indignation at Constantinople—Veccus deposed—The Sicilian Vespers—Pope Martin IV. excommunicates Michael—Michael dies, repudiated by the Greeks, and by his son and successor, Andronicus the Elder—Fall of the Seven Churches of Asia—*The Babylonish Captivity*—Knights Hospitallers conquer Rhodes—Cruel end of the Templars—Marriage of Andronicus the Younger with Anne of Savoy—His unsuccessful appeal to Pope John XXII.—Barlaam—The Hesychasts—Pope Clement VI. in favour of a Council—Servia under its Tsar, Stephen Dushan—John V. Emperor—Return of the Pope from Avignon—John does homage to the Pope—Despised by the Greeks; arrested at Venice for debt—Battle of Kossova—Of Nicopolis—Timour's victory at Angora—The Great Schism in the Roman Church—Councils of Pisa—Constance—Communion in both Kinds forbidden—End of Roman Schism—Pope Martin V. sends envoys to Constantinople—Council of Basle—Pope Eugenius IV.'s Council of Ferrara; transferred to Florence—Council of Basle excommunicates the Pope—Mark of Ephesus—Union of Florence—Repudiated by all nations of the Greek Church—Three Patriarchs threaten to excommunicate the Emperor—Battle of Varna—Constantine II.'s union with Rome—The Greeks leave St. Sophia's as polluted—The fall of Constantinople—The Janissaries—George Scholarius elected Patriarch . . pp. 287—329

CHAPTER X.

The Greek Church after the Fall of Constantinople.

CONQUEST of Servia; Trebizond; Bosnia; Albania; Herzegovina—Otranto conquered, but re-captured—The Abbasside Caliph deposed; Selim assumes the office and title—The Holy Sepulchre comes under the Turks—Solomon takes Buda and Rhodes—Knights Hospitallers settle at Malta—The Battle of Lepanto—Turks take Crete—History of the Greek Church, a series of murders, depositions, and persecutions of Patriarchs—Correspondence between Lutherans and Patriarchs of Constantinople—Patriarch Jeremias II. deposed, and Metrophanes appointed—Jeremias restored—*The Answers* of the Patriarch Jeremias—*The Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem*—Synod of Jassy—Of Bethlehem—Cyril Lucar—Ecclesiastical policy of Mahomet II.—Cyril deposed five times—His birth and education—Meletius Pega, Patriarch of Alexandria—Peter Skarga and Possevin—Cyril's opposition to the Unia—Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria—Intercourse between the Greek and Anglican Churches—Metrophanes Critopoulos—Cyril presents Laud with an Arabic Pentateuch; and Charles I. with the *Codex Alexandrinus*—Cyril translated to Constantinople—Cyril and the Printing Press—*The Confession of Faith*—Accusations and banishments—Falsely accused by the Jesuits, and strangled—The same punishment inflicted on his

successor, Cyril II. (of Berœa)—Parthenius, the next Patriarch, murdered—Peter Mogila—His *Orthodox Confession*—Between A.D. 1650—1693 two Patriarchs murdered by the Turks; one banished and re-elected twice; two, five times—The Synod of Bethlehem under Dositheus—*Eighteen Articles* of—Further intercourse between the Greek and Anglican Churches—Greek College at Oxford—Schismatical correspondence of the Non-jurors with the Greek Patriarchs—True character of revealed by Archbishop Wake . . . . . pp. 330—354

PART II.

The Greco-Russian Church.

CHAPTER I.

The Building up of the Russian Church.

The conversion of Russia—Russia practically the head of the Orthodox Greek Church—Traditional visit of St. Andrew to Russia—Ruric assumes the government of Novgorod—Two of his companions conquer Kief—Expedition against Constantinople, which is only saved by a miracle—Christian church built at Kief, and a bishop sent from Constantinople—Russia twice again attacks Constantinople—Olga—Baptized at Constantinople by the Patriarch Polyeuctes—Takes to Russia a Greek priest—Her son, Sviatislaf, Grand Prince—Her grandson, Vladimir, Grand Prince—The dissipation of his early life—Feodor and Ivan, Martyrs and Saints—Christian impression left on Vladimir by Olga—His preference for the Greek Church—Takes Cherson (Sebastopol)—Marries the Greek Princess Anna—Is baptized under Greek name Basil—Builds a church at Cherson—"The Lady of Vladimir"—Takes Greek priests and deacons to Russia—His twelve sons baptized—Vladimir, the Ethelbert of Russia—The Russian nation baptized—Christianity takes deep root—Vladimir's life completely altered—Builds churches, monasteries, and schools—The "Old Slavic" language of Cyril and Methodius, the Church language—Kief, of which Vladimir built the Cathedral, the Metropolitan see—Michael, the first bishop; a Syrian—Nicolas, a Greek, the second bishop, consecrates the Cathedral—There Anna, Vladimir, and Olga, buried—Vladimir's sons, Boris and Gleb, murdered; Saints of the Russian Church—His son and successor, Yaroslaf I., a theologian and legislator—Yaroslaf's son, Vladimir, builds Cathedral of Novgorod, and monastery of St. George—The Bible an important element in Russian schools . . . . . pp. 355—363

CHAPTER II.

The Russian Church under Metropolitans.

THEOPEMPTUS first Metropolitan; sent into Russia by the Patriarch Alexius—The Metropolitans, Greeks sent by Patriarchs of Constantinople—Hilarion, the next Metropolitan, an exception—The Father of Russian monasticism—The Pechersky built by the monk Antony, and presided over by St. Theodosius—Russian Church made common cause with others of Greek Church in the great schism—The Appanages—Influence of the Metropolitans—Dealings of the Grand Duke Isiaslaf with Pope Gregory VII.—Latter offers to confer the Russian throne "dono sancti Petri"—Schism in Roman Church—The Metropolitan Ivan II. adduces six errors in Roman Church—Several Metropolitans warn the Grand Princes against errors of Rome—Nicephorus, the Metropolitan, cast off Rome as a gangrened member—Importance of Kief—The city with its churches destroyed—Vladimir built—Decline of Kief—St. Niphont—Schism in Russian Church—Yury Dolgorouki builds Moscow—Kief reduced—Vladimir made the capital—The Metropolitans consecrated at Nicæa—Attempt of Pope Innocent III. on Russian Church—Uniat Church at Galich—The "Knights of the Sword"—Prince Daniel tells Innocent IV. a union could only be effected by General Council—Pope Alexander IV. threatens Daniel with divine judgment—The Mongols under Genghis Khan attack Russia—Retire—Arrive again under Batou—Highly flourishing state of Russian Church—Attachment of Russians to their Church—Zeal for building monasteries—Union in Russian Church—Vladimir burnt, and the Grand Prince Yury II., killed—Immense slaughter—Moscow burnt—Tver sacked—The Cathedral of Kief burnt—The Golden Horde—Alexander Nevski—Defeats the Swedes and the Knights of the Sword—Cyril II., Patriarch—Nevski's answer to Pope Innocent IV.—His death—Reduced number of Russian sees—Council at Vladimir—Cyril founds see of Sarai—Vladimir the Metropolitan see—The metropolitans henceforward Russians, elected by clergy, and confirmed by Tsar—Moscow made the Metropolitan see, by the Metropolitan, St. Peter—St. Sergius founds the Troitza monastery—St. Alexis, Metropolitan—Builds the Choudof monastery—Pimen—Cyprian, Metropolitan—Photius, Metropolitan—Kief made a second Metropolitan see—Isidore, Metropolitan—Joins the Union of Florence—Deposed as a traitor—Ivan III.'s marriage with Sophia, daughter of Thomas Palæologus—Mongol supremacy comes to an end—Ivan conquers Novgorod and incorporates it—Zosimus and the Strigolniks—Ivan's daughter, Helena, married to the King of Poland—The intolerance of Popes Alexander VI. and Julius II. causes a war between Russia and Poland—Basil V. divorces his wife Salome and marries Helena Glinsky—Birth of Ivan the Terrible—His character—The Metropolitan Macarius—Ivan assumes title of Tsar—His wife, the virtuous Anastasia Romanof—"The Hundred Chapters Synod"—Kazan conquered and made a Metropolitan see—Astrachan conquered and its Church placed under Kazan—Mission sent to the Caucasus—Deaths of Anastasia and Macarius—Reign of Terror—St. Philip, Metropolitan—The Opreechniks—Martyrdom of St. Philip—Terrible massacre at Novgorod—Pscof threatened, but saved—Moscow burnt—Pope Gregory XIII. praises the piety and amiable qualities of Ivan the Terrible—Ivan and the Jesuit Possevin—Murder of his eldest son—Ivan receives the tonsure and dies . . . . . pp. 364—400

CHAPTER III.

The Russian Church under Patriarchs.

FEODOR I., Tsar—Death of his young brother, Dmitri—Joachim, Patriarch of Antioch, in Moscow—Boris Godunof suggests to the Tsar that his presence might be availed of for raising the Metropolitan see into a Patriarchate—Job appointed Metropolitan—Jeremias II. three times deposed—Sultan Murad plundered the property of the Church, converted the Patriarchal church into a mosque, and ordered Jeremias to build another—Jeremias goes to Moscow to raise money—Takes with him emblems of the Saviour's Passion—The Tsar proposes that he should be Patriarch, residing at Vladimir—The Patriarch, finding this impossible, consecrates Job Patriarch of Moscow, after a synod at Moscow—The Russian Church now had a Patriarch, and four Metropolitan sees—Two years afterwards, Dionysius, Metropolitan of Bulgaria, took to Moscow a synodal Letter from the Eastern Patriarchs approving the appointment of Job—But only in the fifth place, not, as was wished, in the second place—Success of the Reformation in Poland—Eminent position of Poland under Sigismond I. and II.—It adopts the *Protestant* Reformation—The Jesuits introduced, and recover Poland to Roman Church—The Kingdom of Poland becomes elective—Henry of Valois elected; and on his becoming King of France, Stephen Batory, a Protestant, elected—Induced by the Jesuits to join the Church of Rome, to gain the hand of Anna Jagiello—Endeavour of Possevin and Peter Skarga to subject the Russian Church to Rome—Sigismond III., a bigoted Romanist, elected King—Becomes King of Sweden in succession to his father, but deposed—Treaty of Lublin—Persecution of the Orthodox—Michael Ragoza, Metropolitan of Kief—Cyril Terlecky and Ignatius Potsi the authors of the Unia—Joined by Ragoza—Two Synods at Brest—Constantine Prince of Ostrog—A complete Slavic Bible—Nicephorus and Cyril Lucar, Exarchs to Brest—The Uniats persecuted—Decadence of Polish literature—Boris Godunof, Tsar—False Dmitris—"The Period of Troubles"—Job deposed—His death—Hermogenes, Patriarch—Ignatius intruded Patriarch—Hermogenes dies a Martyr—Ladislaus, Sigismond's son, Tsar—End of the Troubles—Michael, Tsar—His father Philaret, Patriarch—Alexis, Tsar—His piety—Nicon translates the remains of St. Philip to Moscow—Nicon, Patriarch—His Reforms—Revision of the Service-books—The "Old Books" and "New Books"—Opposition—Through Nicon the Ukraine recovered—Nicon degraded and deposed—The Staroviertsi—Nicon a common Kaloir under his three successors—Feodor II., Tsar—Orders the liberation of Nicon—Nicon dies on his homeward journey—His character . . . . . pp. 401—430

CHAPTER IV.

The Russian Church under the Holy Governing Synod.

ANECDOTE of Peter the Great and St. Metrophanes, the last of Russian Saints—The Patriarch Adrian—Foundation of Petersburg laid—Monastery of St. Alexander Nevski—An Exarch appointed—The Academy of Kief—Theophanes Procopovich—Barlaam—Stephen Javorski, Exarch—The

Holy Governing Synod—Javorski, Procurator—Luthero-Calvinism in Russia—*The Spiritual Regulation*—An *Appendix*—Members of the Synod—Approved by Eastern Patriarchs—The Procurator a layman—Election of bishops—Other Orthodox States adopt a Synod—The Consistorial Courts—The Cantoirs—The abolition of the Patriarchate, not Erastian—Coronation of the Tsar—The Church a check on the Tsar, not the Tsar on the Church—Peter's Reforms—Unpopular—The English Non-jurors and Peter and Holy Synod—Correspondence stopped by death of Peter—Peter and the Fathers of the Sorbonne—Russia the natural Protector of the Greek Church—Existence of Turks in Europe due to jealousy of Christian Nations—Treaty of Carlowitz—Of the Pruth—Venice loses the Morea—Treaty of Passarowitz—Peace of Belgrade—Turks driven out of Moldavia and Wallachia—Constantinople saved by the plague—Treaty of Kainardji dictated by Catherine II.—Treaty of Sistova—Of Campo Formio—Gradual decadence of Poland—Its three partitions—Return of Uniats—Uniat College instituted by Nicholas I.—Josaphat Bulgak—Joseph Siemasko, second head—College placed under Holy Synod—Second return of Uniats—Anger of Pope Gregory XVI.—Continuous dismemberment of Turkey in last century—Foundation of the Georgian Church—St. Nina—Georgia annexed to Russia—The seamless robe; the Cross of St. Nina—Servia gains its independence—Convention of Akerman—War of Greek Independence—Murder of the Patriarch Gregory, and many bishops—Attitude of the Tsar Alexander I.—Lord Byron—Capo d'Istrias, President—George Canning—Treaty of London—Of Adrianople—Otho, King—The Holy Synod of Kingdom of Greece—Revolution—King George marries a Russian Princess—Ionian Islands restored to Greece by England—Visit of Archbishop Lycurgos to England—Friendly correspondence of Greek and Anglican Churches—Treaty of Paris—Bulgarian massacres—Letter of Archbishop of Belgrade to Archbishop of Canterbury—Turkey cedes Cyprus to England—The Anglican Church in Cyprus; to uphold the Church of the country—Treaty of Berlin—Bosnia and Herzegovina placed under Austria—Montenegro enlarged—Bulgaria divided, but Eastern Roumelia afterwards annexed to Bulgaria—Enlargement of Greece—Recovery of Crete to Greek Church—Montenegro always free, and, under its Vladikas, Orthodox—Vladika Peter II., the Patron-Saint of Montenegro . . . . . pp. 431—463

CONCLUSION.

The Reunion of Christendom.

Count Le Maistre and reunion—Dr. Döllinger and the Nationality of Church of England—"The A.P.U.C."—Last Lambeth Conference—The Liturgy of St. James—Church not founded on St. Peter—Vatican Council of 1870—Votes, how obtained—Irish bishops and Infallibility—Vatican dogma—End of the Pope's Temporal Dominion—Disproofs of the dogma—Cardinal Manning and the *Forged Decretals*—Rome's condemnation of Anglican Orders—Of the Greek Church—Revival of Greek Church—Rev. W. Palmer on Greek and Roman Churches—Important document from the Orthodox Patriarchate to Church of England—*Guardian* on Councils of Lyons and Florence—Importance of Lambeth

Conferences—First Conference in 1867—Second in 1878—Third in 1888—Basis of Re-union—Fourth in 1897—Thirty-sixth Resolution of—Bishop of Salisbury's visit to the East—Correspondence between Archbishop of Canterbury and Patriarch of Constantinople—Erection of *Theodore Memorial Press*—Letter of Patriarch to Bishop of Salisbury—The *Old Catholics*—The Bonn Conferences—Differences as to the *Filioque*—First Bonn Conference—Second Bonn Conference—Unanimous agreement at—Dr. Döllinger on Anglican and Roman Orders—The *Decretum de Armeniis*—The *Perrectio instrumentorum*—Dr. Pusey and the Bonn Conferences—Visit of Archbishop of Finland to England—Foundation of Jerusalem bishopric in 1841—Revival of in 1885—Consecration of St. George's Church—Anglican Church and troubles at Beyrout—Sketch of Anglican teaching by Bishop of Salisbury, for committee at Constantinople—False notions of Anglican Church—Diet of *Spires*—*Ecclesia Anglicana*—*Private Judgment*, and Thirty-fourth Article—Catholic spirit of Thirty-nine Articles—The Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*—No overt act of separation between Greek and Anglican Churches—England independent of Rome—Testimony of Cardinal Manning—Points of contact between Greek and Anglican Churches—Great love of the Bible in Russia—Account of introduction of the *Filioque*—The creed of Rufinus—St. Hilary of Poitiers and the Nicene Creed—The doctrine of the *Procession* in the Fathers—The two creeds given in St. Epiphanius—Expansion of Nicene Creed to meet local requirements—No alteration allowable after Council of Chalcedon—The Constantinopolitan form usurped Nicene title—Imported from East into West at Council of Toledo—With addition of the Filioque—Are ἐκπορεύεσθαι and *procedere* equivalent words?—St. Anselm at Synod of Bari—Filioque first acknowledged in England at the Synod of Hatfield—Cardinal Humbert and the Filioque—The Filioque at Nymphæum—At Ferrara—Movements in Church of England for restoration of the primitive Creed—Difficulties in the way . . . . pp. 464—504

APPENDIX I.

Letter of Philaret to Dr. Pinkerton. p. 505

APPENDIX II.

The Orthodox Patriarchate and the Church of England. p. 509

APPENDIX III.

Very Rev. E. Metallinos' "*Imperial and Royal Coronation.*" p. 514

INDEX. p. 515

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE.

A.D.

302. Conversion of Armenia.
318. Conversion of Georgia.
325. First Œcumenical Council.
328. Athanasius becomes Archbishop of Alexandria.
330. Dedication of Constantinople.
332. Commencement of the Eustathian Schism.
— Eusebians commence attacks upon Athanasius.
335. Council of Tyre.
— Dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.
— First banishment of Athanasius.
336. Death of Arius.
337. Death of Constantine the Great.
338. The Hermit Antony visits Alexandria.
— Athanasius returns from exile.
339. His second banishment.
339—342. Athanasius introduces Monasticism into Rome.
340. Council at Rome under Pope Julius.
341. Dedication of Golden Church at Antioch. Dedication Council.
343. Rival Councils of Sardica and Philippopolis.
346. Athanasius returns from banishment.
346—356. The Golden Period.
351—386. St. Cyril bishop of Jerusalem.
352—366. Liberius Pope of Rome.
353. Council of Arles.
355. Council of Milan. Hilary of Poitiers, Hosius, and Liberius banished.
356. Third banishment of Athanasius.
357. Fall of Hosius.
358. Semi-Arian Council of Ancyra.
— Fall of Pope Liberius.
359. Councils of Rimini and Seleucia.
360. Council at Constantinople.

A.D.

360. St. Sophia's at Constantinople dedicated.
361. Return of Athanasius, and Council at Alexandria.
362. Fourth banishment of Athanasius.
363. Return of Athanasius.
365. Council of Lampsacus.
— (Oct. 5) Fifth banishment of Athanasius.
366. (Feb. 1) Return of Athanasius.
370. St. Basil the Great Archbishop of Cæsarea.
372. St. Gregory Nazianzen bishop of Sasima.
373. Death of St. Athanasius.
378. Battle of Hadrianople.
379. (Jan. 1) Death of Basil the Great.
— Gregory Nazianzen begins mission at Constantinople.
381. Second Œcumenical Council. Gregory of Constantinople. Resigns.
— Council of Aquileia.
389. Death of Gregory Nazianzen.
398—404. St. Chrysostom Patriarch of Constantinople.
401. Commencement of Pelagian heresy.
403. Council of the Oak.
404. Chrysostom banished.
407. Death of Chrysostom.
412—444. Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria.
420. Death of St. Jerome.
428. Nestorius Patriarch of Constantinople.
431. Third Œcumenical Council. Nestorius condemned and banished.
437. Translation of St. Chrysostom's body to Constantinople.
449. The Latrocinium.
451. The fourth Œcumenical Council.
452. Monophysite schism in the Church of Jerusalem.
457. Schism in Church of Alexandria.
471. Schism at Antioch.
476—800. Abeyance of Western Empire.
482. Thalaia Patriarch of Alexandria. Expelled.
— Henoticon published.
484—518. Schism between Constantinople and Rome.
489. Suppression of School of Edessa.

A.D.

491. Synod of Vagarshabad.
— Antioch ravaged by Earthquakes.
532. Insurrection of the Nika, and destruction of St. Sophia's.
536. Rome taken by Belisarius.
537—555. Vigilius Pope of Rome.
537. St. Sophia's rebuilt and consecrated.
544. Justinian's edict against *Three Chapters*.
548. *Judicatum* of Vigilius.
551. Justinian's Ὁμολογία Πίστεως.
552. Synod of Tovin.
553. Fifth Œcumenical Council.
— *Constitutum* of Vigilius.
563. Justinian's edict ordering Aphthardocetism (or Aphthartodocetism).
582—595. John *the Faster* Patriarch of Constantinople.
589. Third council of Toledo.
609. Rise of Mahometanism.
609—616. John *the Almoner* Patriarch of Constantinople.
614. Jerusalem and the True Cross taken by the Persians.
622. The Hegira.
625—638. Honorius Pope of Rome.
626. Jerusalem and the True Cross recovered.
632. Death of Mahomet.
634—637. Sophronius Patriarch of Jerusalem.
637. Jerusalem taken by Saracens.
638. The *Ecthesis* published.
— Antioch taken.
648. The *Type* published.
649. First Lateran council.
669—675. Saracens unsuccessfully attack Constantinople.
680. Sixth Œcumenical Council.
691. Trullan council.
709. Fall of Patriarchate of Alexandria under Saracens.
714. Spain conquered by Mahometans.
726. First edict against the Images.
730. Second edict against the Images.
732. Charles Martell's Victory at Tours.
754. Iconoclastic council of Constantinople.

A.D.

762. Foundation of Bagdad.
784—806. St. Tarasius Patriarch of Constantinople.
787. Seventh Œcumenical Council.
794. Council of Frankfort.
800. Revival of Western Empire.
823. Saracens conquer Sicily and Crete.
842. *Festival of Orthodoxy* established (February 19).
846—857; 867—877. Ignatius Patriarch of Constantinople.
857—867; 877—886. Photius Patriarch of Constantinople.
858—867. Nicolas I. Pope of Rome.
862. Ruric lays foundation of Russian Empire.
863. Conversion of Moravia.
864. Conversion of Bulgaria.
866. Revolution at Constantinople.
867. Encyclical of Photius against Latin Church.
—— Photius deposed and Ignatius restored.
—— Death of St. Cyril.
871. Conversion of Bohemia.
877. Death of Ignatius and restoration of Photius.
879. Council at Constantinople confirms his restoration.
885. Death of Methodius.
886. Deposition of Photius.
907. Battle of Pressburg.
923. Bulgaria made a Patriarchate.
933—950. Eutychius the Historian Patriarch of Alexandria.
961. Nicephorus Phocas reconquers Crete.
965. Nicephorus Phocas takes Cyprus.
968. Nicephorus Phocas takes Antioch.
969. Fatimites found Caliphate of Cairo.
972. Baptism of Olga.
988. Baptism of Vladimir I. followed by that of Russian people.
1000. Poland created a Kingdom.
1037—1589. Russian Church under Metropolitans.
1054. Commencement of schism between East and West.
1071. Battle of Manzikert.
1075. Pope Gregory VII. offers to Russia to become a fief of Rome.
1076. Jerusalem taken by Seljuks.

A.D.

1080—1088. Ivan II. Metropolitan of Russia; exposes six heresies in Roman Church.
1095. Councils of Piacenza and Clermont.
1096—1268. The Crusades.
1097. Council of Bari.
1099. Jerusalem taken by Crusaders.
1099—1187. Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem.
1173. Fatimite Caliphate suppressed by Saladin.
1187. Battle of Tiberias.
1191. Cyprus taken by Richard Cœur de Lion.
1193. Death of Saladin.
1197—1256. St. Niphont.
1201. Knights of the Sword established.
1203. Constantinople taken by Crusaders.
1204—1261. Latin Empire of Romania.
1205. Uniat Church set up at Galich.
1215. Fourth Lateran Council.
1221. Mongols enter Russia.
1224. Battle of the Kalka.
1232. Conference at Nymphæum between Greeks and Latins.
1237—1477. Period of Mongol Invasions of Russia.
—— Moscow burnt.
1242. Kief and the Pechersky Monastery burnt.
—— Golden Horde established.
1243. Jerusalem taken by Corasmians.
1246—1260. Reign of St. Alexander Nevski.
1251. Pope Alexander IV. tries to induce Nevski to join Roman Church.
1261. Restoration of Greek Empire and Orthodox Church.
1266. Commencement of Arsenian schism at Constantinople.
1274. Council of Lyons.
1282. Sicilian Vespers.
1283. Purification of St. Sophia's after Latin Services.
1299. Rise of the Ottoman Turks.
—— Metropolitan See of Russia removed to Vladimir.
1310. Knights Hospitallers conquer Rhodes.
1312. Suppression of Knights Templars.
c. 1312. Fall of the Churches of Asia.

A.D.

1315—1392. St. Sergius, founder of Troitza Monastery.
1328—1341. Ivan I. Grand Prince; removes Metropolitan See to Moscow.
1331—1355. Stephen Dushan Tsar of Servia.
1353—1377. St. Alexis Metropolitan of Moscow; founder of Choudof monastery.
1356. Turks capture Gallipoli.
1362—1389. Dmitri Donskoi Grand Prince of Russia.
1380. Battle of the Don.
1389. Battle of Kossova.
1396. Battle of Nicopolis.
1400. Defeat of Bajazet by Timour at Angora.
1409. Council of Pisa.
1414—1418. Council of Constance.
1431—1443. Council of Basle.
1438. Council of Ferrara.
1439. Council of Florence.
1443. Union of Florence repudiated in synod at Jerusalem.
1444. Battle of Varna.
1452. Union of Florence proclaimed in St. Sophia's.
1453. Fall of Constantinople.
1459. Servia; 1461 Trebizond; 1463 Bosnia; 1467 Albania; 1483 Herzegovina; 1517 Jerusalem and Holy Sepulchre; 1522 Rhodes taken by Turks. Knights Hospitallers receive Malta.
1462—1505. Ivan III. Grand Prince.
1470. Rise of the Strigolniks in Russia.
1472. Ivan III. marries Heiress of the Palæologi.
1477. Shakes off Mongol yoke.
1517. Revision of Russian Service-Books by Maximus.
1547. Ivan IV. assumes title of Tsar.
1551. The Hundred Chapters Synod.
1552. Metropolitan See of Kazan formed.
1559. Melancthon opens correspondence with Greek Church.
1569. Martyrdom of St. Philip.
—— Treaty of Lublin.
1571. Battle of Lepanto. Turks conquer Cyprus.
1572. Polish throne made elective.

A.D.

1572. Birth of Cyril Lucar.
1574. Turks take Tunis.
—— Tubingen Divines re-open correspondence with Greek Church.
1576. Stephen Batory elected King of Poland.
1581. Jeremias II. declines further correspondence with Tubingen.
1587. Sigismond III. elected King of Poland.
1589—1700. Russian Church under Patriarchs.
1593. Council of Upsala.
1596. Establishment of the Unia.
1598. End of the Dynasty of Ruric.
1602. Cyril Lucar Patriarch of Alexandria.
1613. Romanof family restored.
1616—1661. Friendly relations between Greek and Anglican Churches.
1620—1633. Philaret Patriarch of Moscow.
1621. Cyril Lucar Patriarch of Constantinople.
1627. English Printing-Press imported to Constantinople.
1630. *Confession of Faith* attributed to Cyril.
1632—1647. Peter Mogila Metropolitan of Kief.
1638. Martyrdom of Cyril Lucar.
1642. Synod of Jassy.
1654. Revision of Russian Service-books decreed.
1666. Nicon deposed and banished.
1669. Turks capture Crete.
1672. Synod of Bethlehem.
1681. Death of Nicon.
1682. Treaty of Karlowitz.
1691. Commencement of Non-juring schism.
1701. Guardian of Russian Patriarchate appointed.
1703. Foundation of Petersburg laid.
1705. Education of Greeks at Oxford forbidden.
1711. Treaty of the Pruth.
1713. Arsenius, Archbishop of Thebais, in England.
1715. Venice cedes Morea to Turkey.
1716—1724. Correspondence between Non-jurors and Eastern Patriarchs.
1717. Letter of Non-jurors to Peter the Great.
1718. Treaty of Passarowitz.

A.D.

1721. Holy Governing Synod of Russia instituted.
1724. Correspondence between Non-jurors and Holy Synod.
—— Massacre of Thorn.
1725. Death of Peter the Great.
1739. Peace of Belgrade.
1770. Battle of Kagoul.
1772. First Partition of Poland.
1774. Treaty of Kainardji.
1791. Treaty of Sistova.
1793. Second Partition of Poland.
1795. Third Partition of Poland.
1797. Treaty of Campo Formio.
1801. Georgia annexed to Russia.
—— Insurrection of Servia.
1812. Treaty of Bucharest.
1813. British and Foreign Society established in Russia.
1815. Ionian Islands placed under protectorate of England.
1816 and 1820. Jesuits expelled from Russia and Russian Poland.
1821. Murder of Patriarch Gregory. Commencement of Greek War of Independence.
1826. Convention of Akerman.
—— Janissaries disbanded.
—— Tsar Nicholas I. presents ultimatum to Turkey.
—— Bible Society abolished in Russia.
1827. Treaty of London.
—— Battle of Navarino.
1828. Etchmiadzen becomes part of Russian Empire.
1829. Treaty of Adrianople.
1830. Greece throws off suzerainty of Porte.
1832. Metrophanes, the last Russian Saint, canonized.
1839. Great return of Uniats in Russia to Orthodoxy.
1843. First mission from England to Eastern Syrians.
1856. Treaty of Paris.
1857. A.P.U.C. founded.
—— Ionian Islands ceded to Greece by England.
1867. First Lambeth Conference.
—— Death of the Metropolitan Philaret.
1870. Vatican Council.

A. D.

1870. Visit of Archbishop Lycurgus to England.
1874. First Bonn Conference of Old Catholics.
1875. Return to Orthodoxy of Uniats in Seidlitz, and Zamoscié.
—— Second Bonn Conference.
1878. Cyprus ceded to England.
—— Treaty of Berlin.
—— Second Lambeth Conference.
1884. Second mission from England to Eastern Syrians.
1885. Revival of English Bishopric in Jerusalem.
1888. Third Lambeth Conference.
1896. Delegation of Bishop of London to Tzar's Coronation.
1897. Fourth Lambeth Conference.
—— Delegation of Archbishop of Finland to late Queen's Jubilee.
1898. Consecration of St. George's Church at Jerusalem.
—— Withdrawal of Turks from Crete.
—— Visit of Bishop of Salisbury to the East. Correspondence between Archbishop of Canterbury and Patriarch of Constantinople.
1899. Erection of Theodore Memorial Press at Phanar.

ERRATA.

p. 17, line 2 from bottom, *for* Canstantinople *read* Constantinople.
p. 17, line 2 from bottom, *for* soon after *read* before.
p. 95, line 15, *omit* and Jacob of Nisibis.
p. 123, line 12 from bottom, *for* 378 *read* 379.
p. 131, line 3, *omit* dates.
p. 133, line 2 from bottom, *begin new sentence at* Not.
p. 133, last line, *for* He *read* he.
p. 134, line 5, *for* Arcadius *read* Theodosius.
p. 141, line 6, *for* quited *read* quitted.
p. 182, line 9, *for* 598 *read* 588.
p. 220, line 5 from bottom, *for* 438 *read* 338.
p. 272, line 8 from bottom, *for* Pontus *read* Porto.
p. 277, line 11, *for* Sviatoslaf *read* Sviatislaf.
p. 300, notes c and d; both taken from Nicephorus.
p. 311, line 8 from bottom, *for* Lyons *read* Vienne.
p. 356, line 8 from bottom, *for* 860 *read* 866.
p. 357, line 10 from bottom, *for the latter year read* 957.
p. 375, line 3, *for* Pscof *read* Pskof.
p. 379, line 15 from bottom, *for* Pymen *read* Pimen.
p. 383, line 16, *for* Patriarch *read* Metropolitan.
p. 398, line 12, *for* Moscow *read* Novgorod.
p. 405, line 2 from bottom, *for* Motropolitan *read* Metropolitan.

INTRODUCTION.

Some Characteristics of the Greek Church.

The Greek and Anglican Churches derive their faith from the same sources: the Bible as the foundation, tradition as founded on the Bible, and the Œcumenical Councils as guided by the Holy Spirit. The Greek Church professes that it has never departed from primitive Orthodoxy; the Anglican that, having departed from it for a time, it returned to it, after the Renaissance, at the Reformation.

But if in matters of faith the two Churches have the same starting-point; if between them there is a general consensus in the essentials of Christianity; no two things could strike a spectator as more dissimilar than the simple ritual of an average Anglican service, and the ornate and symbolic ceremonial of the Greek Church. And the reason of this difference is not far to seek, but is expressed in our XXXIVth Article; whilst doctrine must be at all times and in all places one and the same, "every particular or National Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things are done to edifying."

The Orthodox Greek Church includes the Patriarchal Sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and the Church of Russia, the Holy Governing Synod of which possesses Patriarchal rank. It likewise includes the Churches of Greece, Cyprus, Georgia, Servia, Montenegro, and Roumania. There are also three Or-

thodox Greek Churches in Austria-Hungary. All these Churches own, at least theoretically, the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople, as the Roman Church owns that of the Pope of Rome, and the Anglican Churches throughout the world the supremacy of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Besides the Orthodox Church there are several Greek Churches which do not own the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople, but are under Patriarchs of their own. They are really *national* Churches; they cannot be called *heretical*, for some of them (if ever they were) are not *now* heretical; but, so far as they are out of Communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople, are all of them schismatical.

It is proposed in this introductory chapter to touch on some characteristics of the Orthodox Church (principally where it differs from the Anglican Church), such as are not dwelt upon in the subsequent chapters of this work.

The differential title of the Greek Church is *Orthodox*, of the Roman, *Catholic*, of the Anglican, (for the word *Protestant* is not used in its daily Services nor found in its Articles), *Anglo-Catholic*.

The Orthodox Church is the oldest Church in Christendom; Greek Christianity was the parent of Latin Christianity. Jerusalem was the mother-Church; in Antioch the disciples were first called Christians. From the East Christianity was brought into the West; the British Church derived its origin from the East, through the Church in Gaul; the earliest principal writers of ecclesiastical history were Greeks; the Seven Œcumenical Councils were held in the East; the earliest Popes of Rome were Greeks. Till the foundation of Constantinople Christi-

anity continued to be, both in the East and West, a Greek religion. After Constantine founded Constantinople or "*New Rome*" on the ruins of the Greek Byzantium, although Latin was the official language, Greek continued to be the language of the Church. But in "*Old Rome*" Latin gradually superseded it, and by degrees became the language of the Western Church; but not till the translation of the Vulgate by St. Jerome was the Roman Church completely Latinized, and turned from a Greek into a Latin Church.

Subsequently to the foundation of Constantinople (but at what precise time is uncertain) the Patriarchal title was conferred on the Sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, "Old Rome" being the only Patriarchal See in the West. By the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon Old and New Rome were placed on an equality, an honorary precedence being from the first accorded to the former. Later on, the title—which it has ever since borne—of *the Œcumenical See* was conferred on Constantinople. By the Council of Chalcedon Jerusalem was made the Fifth Patriarchate. The number of five Patriarchs was held to be inviolable; but Old Rome was considered to have fallen out of the number through the Great Schism; and towards the end of the sixteenth century (to complete the number), Moscow was made a Patriarchate for Russia; but this was changed in the reign of Peter the Great into "*The Most Holy Governing Synod of all the Russias.*"

. . . . . .

The higher clergy being forbidden and the lower clergy (provided they were married before Ordination) being allowed, and at one time compelled, to be married, the bishops are generally taken from the monasteries. In

the case of a married presbyter being appointed, his wife must retire into a monastery; in the event of her refusing to abandon her husband and children, the presbyter must decline the appointment.

The principal monastery is Mt. Athos, called *Ἅγιον Ὄρος* (*Holy Mountain*), with its twenty-one establishments, which nothing female is allowed to enter. The monasteries, following the rule of St. Basil, are presided over by Archimandrites (*ἀρχοί μάνδρα*) and Hegumens (*ἡγούμενοι*). The lower clergy are of two classes: the Regular or monastic, who are called Kaloirs (*καλόγεροι*; a name implying that they were originally *old men*); and the Secular or parochial clergy; in Russia the two classes are distinguished as the Black and White clergy, the parochial clergy being designated Popes, chief amongst whom are the Protopopes.

Owing to the miserable state of servitude in which the Greeks have long lived, and the jealousy and avarice of the Turks, it cannot be expected that, in lands subject to Turkey, anything deserving the name of architecture, or rich adjuncts of religion, exist; the former, says Sir Paul Ricaud, English Consul at Smyrna in the last quarter of the seventeenth Century, the Turks would regard as an evil intention to imitate their mosques; whilst anything of value the Turks would lay hands on. Their churches, he says, at that time resembled caverns or sepulchres, the tops scarcely levelling the ground. But in this respect a better state of things has set in since the last century, and there is no reason to doubt that, when the Greeks have been delivered from their fast-vanishing thraldom, their churches will be, if not as sumptuous, at any rate as well adapted to God's service, as our own. Greco-Russian churches are amongst the most splendid in the world.

The Byzantine style, where any architecture exists, is that usually followed, St. Sophia's at Constantinople being taken as the general model. A Byzantine church may be described as a gabled Greek Cross with domes, sometimes five, sometimes more in number; (in the churches of St. Sophia at Kief and Novgorod, built in the reigns of Vladimir and Yaroslaf, there were originally thirteen domes, to represent Christ and the twelve Apostles); the domes being generally gilded and having an imposing appearance. On some Greek churches the Crescent appears under the Cross, the Crescent signifiying the Virgin, the Cross the Saviour, the two together symbolizing the Anchor, the Christian's hope beyond the grave.

In Greek churches (except in cathedrals and more important churches, stalls for bishops) no seats are provided, it being generally considered an act of irreverence for any one of lower rank than a bishop to sit in God's house. The congregation stand, that being the custom of the primitive Church; they do not kneel, that also being unusual in early times[a]; and only incline the body in receiving the Eucharist[b]; but they express their reverence by prostrating themselves, sometimes touching the ground with their foreheads; especially is this the case with the lower classes.

Orientation of churches is more scrupulously observed in the East than in the West; and praying towards the East is the almost universal custom. This also

[a] Except (says Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church," XX. 23), "Penitents, whom the canons obliged to pray kneeling, even on the days of relaxation."

[b] Κύπτων καὶ τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν. Cyril of Jerus. Cat. V.

was the primitive practice; although Socrates mentions an exception in the Church of Antioch[c].

The wall which surrounds the church and out-buildings is called *περίβολον;* the *πρόπυλον* is the porch. In the churches there is a four-fold division;

(I.) The Narthex (*νάρθηξ*); the derivation of which is uncertain[d]; immediately inside which is the font (*κολυμβήθρα*). The Narthex was originally set apart for Catechumens (*κατηχούμενοι*), penitents (*ἀκροώμενοι*), and the possessed (*ἐνεργούμενοι*), but is now the part occupied by women, the former women's galleries (*ὑπερῶα*) having fallen into disuse.

(II.) The Nave (*νάος*), so called from a ship, the symbolic figure of our salvation (Gen. vii. 23); or *τράπεζα* (*table*) from the love-feasts originally held in that, the lay part of the Church; where in Cathedrals are stalls, one higher than the rest for the Patriarch, the others for the Metropolitans and Bishops.

(III.) The Choir (*χόρος*) under the Trullus or Dome.

(IV.) The Bema (*ἅγιον βῆμα*); (*ἀναβάινω*, from its being raised) or Altar; corresponding to the Western Chancel.

There are several sets of gates;

(I.) The Beautiful Gates (*πύλαι ὡραῖαι*), so called from the Beautiful Gate of the Temple, leading from the Porch into the Narthex.

(II.) The Royal Gates (*πύλαι βασιλικαί*), dividing the Narthex from the Nave.

(III.) The Holy Gates (*ἅγιαι θυραί*), three in number with veils (*καταπέτασματα*) before them, leading from

[c] H.E. V. 12, *οὐ γὰρ πρὸς ἀνατολὴν θυσιαστήριον ἀλλὰ πρὸς δύσιν ὁρᾷ.*

[d] Some derive it from *νέρθε*, below the Nave. Bingham thinks it is from *νάρθηξ* ((*ferula*), by which the Greeks expressed an oblong figure

the Choir into the *Holy of Holies*[e]; the middle one into the Bema, that on the North into the *Prothesis*, that on the South into the *Diaconicon*. In the centre of the Bema, which is raised on a foot-pace (κρηπίς), is the Holy Table (ἁγία τράπεζα; called by St. Chrysostom, τράπεζα μυστικὴ καί φρικτὴ), standing out from the wall, with the σύνθρονος, or seats for the bishop and presbyters, which were often joined together[f]; having four columns supporting a canopy (κιβώριον). The word Altar is not generally applied to the Holy Table, but is the whole space between it and the Iconostasis.

This last is a high screen corresponding to our Altar-rails, but higher and solid, so that the congregation is prevented from seeing the consecration of the elements and the Communion of the clergy. Before it lamps, sometimes perpetually burning, are suspended; on it are several Icons or Images: one of the Saviour on the South, another of the Virgin on the North, side; others of various saints, one being the Patron-Saint of the church. Between the Iconostasis and the Choir is the Soleas (σωλεῖον)[g]. On the North of the Choir, in the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, but frequently in other churches on the North of the Trapeza, is the Ambon (ἀναβαίνω), a stone raised on one, two, or three steps, from which the deacon says the Ectænias, reads the Gospel, gives out the notices and the diptychs; and from which the sermon, when there is one, is preached. The Epistle is read by the Reader (ἀναγνωστής).

At the back of the Holy Table is a representation of

[e] Bingham, VIII. 6, 8. [f] Ib. VIII. 6, 10.

[g] Bingham and Beveridge are of opinion that this was the Emperor's throne (*solium*); others derive it from solea, *ground*.

the Crucifixion, before which stands a lamp with seven branches. A Pyx (*ἀρτοφόριον*), containing the reserved Sacrament, stands on the Holy Table, a lighted lamp being suspended before it; and on the Table lie a Book of the Gospels and a Cross. The Antiminsia or *consecrated Corporal* is spread over the usual covering, and forms an important feature in the celebration; sometimes it is used as a portable Altar.

A Greek church is generally tri-apsidal. The Centre apse is the Bema; the Northern the Prothesis (*πρόθεσις*); the Southern the Sacristy or Vestry (*διακονικόν, σκευοφυλάκιον, μινσατώριον*); these two last are generally divided from the Bema by walls (*παραβήματα*).

There is usually only one Holy Table and one chapel, as was the custom in the primitive Church; this continued so in the Western Church, till about the time of St. Gregory the Great; where there are more than one chapel in a Greek church, it is generally in places which have been brought under Latin influence.

Greek Churches contain no stoups; Socrates speaks of sprinkling with water as a heathen custom [h]. The Piscina (*θάλασσα*) now commonly called *χωνεύτηριον*, is either in the Prothesis, or under the Holy Table.

In the early service-books of the East are to be found the hymns of the primitive Church. In Russian Churches vocal singing is of a very beautiful character; but organs and other musical instruments are rigidly prohibited in Russian and all other Greek Churches. Here again the Greek Church has antiquity on its side; "Music in churches," says Bingham [i], "is as ancient as the Apostles, but instrumental music not so; for it is now generally

[h] "Νόμῳ Ἑλληνικῷ περιέρραινε τοὺς εἰσιόντας." [i] VIII. 7, 14.

believed by learned men that the use of organs came into the Church since the time of Thomas Aquinas, A.D. 1250."

Church bells are forbidden by the Turks, and consequently, except in countries not subject to Turkey, are not used, the people being summoned to Church by a board or iron plate, held in the hand, and beaten with a hammer (*χειροσήμαντρα*).

The ordinary daily dress of an ecclesiastic is a tall flat cap, and a cassock of any sober colour, over which is thrown a loose black cloak. A beard is a matter of obligation; and this is agreeable to the fourth Council of Carthage ("Clericus non barbam radat"); the Roman tonsure (*κούρευμα*) has always been ridiculed by the Greeks.

As to the ecclesiastical vestments of the clergy. There is no evidence to decide what, if any, were the distinctive habits and vestments of the clergy before the time of Constantine the Great. Eusebius[k] speaks of St. John wearing the *πέταλον* or plate of gold. But it is probable that, until the peace of the Church was secured, no distinctive dress was worn, the Church following the civil use; and the surplice and stole of the Anglican Church, as may be learnt from various works of ancient art, correspond to the civil garment of the first three centuries, with its ornamentation as worn by the higher classes. It is reasonable to suppose that when the age of persecution ceased, and more sumptuous churches began to be built, a distinct dress for the higher offices would be adopted; and Theodoret speaks of a rich vestment embroidered with gold being presented by Constantine to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem, for the

[k] H.E. III. 31.

celebration of Baptisms. The fact that the Orthodox Greek Church and the Churches which separated from it wear, in the present day, practically the same vestments, seems to show that those vestments were in use in the East at the time of the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon; and the East probably gave its form of vestments to the West.

Greek bishops (Armenians excepted) wear neither mitre nor ring; but the pectoral Cross (*ἐγκόλπιον*) is common to East and West.

The Vestments, especially in Russia, are often of a very sumptuous character. There is said to be a Russian monastery in which there is a vestment so covered with jewels that it is worth £14,000.

The full canonical vestments of a bishop are:—

(I.) The Sticharion (the derivation of which is uncertain), signifying *purity*, and corresponding to the Latin *alb*.

(II.) Epitrachelion (*stole*), but differing from the Latin stole in having an orifice at the upper extremity for the head to pass through. It signifies *the easy yoke of Christ*. It and the Sticharion are attached to the body by the *girdle* (*ζώνη*).

(III.) Epimanichia (*ἐπί*, manus) *wristbands*, signifying *the bands by which our Saviour was bound*.

(IV.) Phænolion (*chasuble*); this is by way of excellence *the vestment*. It signifies *the purple robe which the soldiers put on Christ;* and is supposed by some (but improbably) to be the same as the cloak which St. Paul left at Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13).

(V.) Omophorion (*pall*), signifying *the wandering sheep which Christ brings home on His shoulder;* or *the Cross borne by the Saviour*.

(VI.) Saccos (*dalmatic*), signifying Christ's coat without seam.

(VII.) Epigonation (*kerchief*), so called because it reaches to the knee (*ἐπὶ γόνυ*); representing, according to some, the towel wherewith our Saviour girded Himself.

The vestments of a priest are the same as the above, omitting the Omophorion and Saccos. A deacon wears only two robes, the Sticharion and, over his left shoulder, the Orarion, called also stole (*στολή*), which exactly corresponds to the Western stole, except that the word *ἅγιος* is thrice embroidered on it[1].

The only Creed which the Greek Church in its services recognizes as such is the Nicene or Constantinopolitan. The Creed commonly called Athanasian, containing the double Procession, is evidently a Western Creed.

In the early Church the Epiphany (*Ἐπιφάνια, Θεοφάνια*) was observed in commemoration of various events in our Saviour's life: (I.) His Nativity (*Γέννησις*); (II.) the Adoration of the Magi (*προσκύνησις τῶν Μαγῶν*; (III.) His Baptism; (IV.) His first miracle in Cana of Galilee. The Greek Church combines all four, and it celebrates the Nativity of our Lord (*τὴν κατὰ σάρκα γέννησιν τοῦ Κυρίου*) thirteen days after our Christmas-Day (i.e. on the day following the Western Epiphany); and seven days later (January 14) the Circumcision (*τὴν περιτόμην*). Christmas-Day is called *Χριστούγεννα*. The Greek for Advent is *παρουσία*, but it is not observed. The Greek

[1] The derivation of the word is uncertain. M. Mouravief derives it from *orare* (to pray); Mr. Wharton Marriot from *ora* (face); others think it is from *ὥρα*, because the deacon gives out the hour of prayer. Neale (Intro. I. 310), quotes St. Simeon of Thessalonica; (*ὡράριον καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἀραίζειν τὸν διάκονον τῇ χάριτι*).

Church has no Ash-Wednesday. Lent (*τεσσαρακοστή*) begins on Monday, called *καθαρὰ δευτέρα*. Palm-Sunday is the Sunday *τῶν Βαΐων;* Easter-Eve is *τὸ Ἅγιον καὶ Μέγα Σάββατον;* Easter Day *τὸ Ἅγιον Πάσχα*, on which day by custom Greeks greet each other with the words *Χριστὸς ἀνέστη*. Ascension-Day is *Ἀνάληψις;* Whitsunday *Πεντηκοστή*. The Greek Church has no Trinity Sunday, but the corresponding day is the day *τῶν Ἁγίων πάντων*.

The Service-books consist of twenty folio volumes (which in Russia are in the Old Slavic language), besides an extra-folio prescribing how they are to be used, and the manner in which the services are to be performed.

The principal Service-books are :—

(I.) *Τυπικόν*, prescribing the regulations of the services. (II.) *Ὀκτώηχος*, divided into eight tones and containing the hymns (*τροπαῖα*) for eight Sundays and weeks ; the *Τριῴδιον* (*three Odes*) or Lent-Book; the *Πεντηκοστάριον*, containing the hymns for Easter-Day to Whitsuntide ; the *Μηναῖα*, monthly books, twelve in number, for the Feasts of the Saints. (III.) *Εὐχολόγιον*, or Book of Prayers, containing the prayers for the use of priests and deacons. (IV.) *Λειτουργικόν*, taken out of the Euchology ; it contains the Liturgies or Communion Services. (V.) *Εὐαγγελιστάριον* (sometimes called *Εὐαγγελιάριον*), containing the lections of all the year. (VI.) *Ὡρολόγιον*, a Reader's Manual containing the Canonical Hours.

The Canonical Hours are ; *Ὥρα πρώτη* (*Prime*) ; *Ὥρα τρίτη* (*Terce*) ; *Ὥρα ἕκτη* (*Sext*) ; *Ὥρα ἐννάτη* or ninth ; *Μεσονύκτιον* (*Compline*) or Midnight ; *Ὄρθρον* (*Matin*) ; *Ἑσπερινόν* (*Vesper*).

The Liturgies or Communion Services (with the exception of that of St. James which is used at Jerusalem

on the Festival of that Saint) are three in number: those of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the Liturgy of the Presanctified (ἡ λειτουργία τῶν προηγιασμένων).

Nearly every day has its appropriate Saint, sometimes more than one, and on the observance of those days the people lay great stress. The Fasts are very numerous (226 days in the year), and very rigorously observed, not only meat, but nearly every kind of fish, as well as eggs, cheese, butter, and milk, being prohibited. Besides the Western Lent there are three other Lents; one lasting from Whitsuntide to St. Peter's Day; a second (for the Dormition of the Virgin; κοίμησις τῆς Παναγίας) from August 1 to August 15; a third (corresponding to our Advent) during the forty days before Christmas. In monasteries another Fast is observed, during the first forty days of September, to commemorate the Exaltation (ὕψωσις) of the Holy Cross. To compensate for the rigorous observance of these Fasts, an opposite licence is often indulged in on Festivals.

The word Sacrament was in the early Church symbolical of various religious acts.

The number of Sacraments which a Church holds necessarily depends upon the meaning it attaches to the word, whether it is the limited sense of our Church Catechism, "as generally necessary to salvation," and "ordained by Christ Himself," or the wider sense of the Greek Church.

The Greek Church holds seven Sacraments or Mysteries; "the *Orthodox Doctrine*," published in 1772 by Plato, Metropolitan of Moscow, which is an authoritative standard in the Russian Church, laying it down that "the two chief and most eminent are Baptism and the Eucharist or Communion;" and those two Sacraments "*The Answers of*

the Patriarch Jeremias to the Tubingen Divines" in 1576 (another authoritative standard) calls *τὰ κυριώτερα τῶν μυστηρίων ὧν δίχα σωθῆναι ἀδύνατον.*

The limitation of the Sacraments or Mysteries to seven was unknown to the undivided Church, and was first defined by Peter Lombard, teacher of Theology at Paris (1159—1164), and the Latin Schoolmen. Scholasticism plays no part in the history of the Eastern Church, and the authority of the Schoolmen is disregarded; yet it would appear that the exact number of seven was, contrary to its usual conservatism, imported into the Greek from the Latin Church.

The Seven Sacraments or Mysteries are:—(I.) Baptism (*τὸ Βάπτισμα*); (II.) Unction with Chrism (*τὸ Μύρον τοῦ Χρίσματος*); (III.) The Eucharist (*ἡ Εὐχαριστία*); (IV.) Penance (*ἡ Μετάνοια*); (V.) Holy Orders (*ἡ Ἱερωσύνη*); (VI.) Marriage (*ὁ Γάμος*); (VII.) Unction with Oil (*τὸ Εὐχέλαιον*).

(I.) Baptism. The "Service for making a Catechumen" precedes the Baptismal Service. In the former the child being turned towards the East, with the hands down, the priest breathes thrice on his face, signs him thrice with the Cross, and lays his hand upon his head. Then follows a prayer and three exorcisms; the priest thrice breathes on him: on his mouth, his forehead, and his breast, with the thrice repeated prayer that God will "drive away from him every evil and unclean spirit hiding and lurking in his heart" (*ἐξέλασον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πᾶν πονηρὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα κεκρυμμένον καὶ ἐμφωλεῦον αὐτοῦ τῇ καρδίᾳ*)[m].

The child is then turned towards the West with his

[m] In the second exorcism is found the expression, "Get thee hence and depart from him who is being prepared for holy illumination;" (*ἔξελθε καὶ ἀναχώρησον ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον φώτισμα εὐτρεπιζομένου*).

hands uplifted. The renunciation of Satan with all his angels and all his works follows; and the sponsor (*ἀνάδοχος*) is bidden "*blow on him and spit upon him*" (*ἐμφύσησον καὶ ἔμπτυσον αὐτῷ*). The child is then again turned towards the East, with his hands down, and the Nicene Creed is said. After the name has been given by the sponsor the service for making a Catechumen ends.

Then follows the service for Baptism. The priest robes himself in the white sacerdotal vestment, with the Maniples; all the tapers are lighted; and the priest censes the font. The deacon then says, "Bless, Master" (*Εὐλόγησον δέσποτα*); and the priest with a loud voice, "Blessed be the Father," etc., "Amen." Then is said the Ectænia; and the priest, after a secret prayer, thrice offers aloud a long prayer commencing, "Great art Thou, O Lord, and wonderful are Thy works, and no word shall be sufficient for the praise of Thy wonders" (*μέγας εἶ, Κύριε, καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς λόγος ἐξαρκέσει πρὸς ὕμνον τῶν θαυμασίων σοῦ*). After this prayer the priest, dipping his right hand in the water and breathing on it, says: "Let all the hostile powers be crushed beneath the sign of the image of Thy Cross" (*συντριβήτωσαν ὑπὸ τὴν σημείωσιν τοῦ τιμίου Σταύρου σοῦ*).

The priest then thrice signs the water *cross-wise.* Then follows the benediction of the oil: the priest blesses the silver cruet of oil (*τὸ τοῦ ἐλαίου ἀγγεῖον*), which is held by the deacon; the priest pours oil into the water, making three crosses with it; he (in Russia with two fingers, in Greece with a sort of needle, wrapped in cotton, from the top of the cruet) anoints the child, making the sign of the Cross on the principal parts of the body; saying, "The servant of God (N) is anointed

with the oil of gladness, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, now and ever, to ages of ages. Amen." The priest, when signing the breast and between the shoulders (*τῶν μεταφρένων*), says: "For the healing of soul and body;" the ears, "For the hearing of faith;" the feet, "That he may walk in the path of Thy commandments;" the hands, "Thy hands have made me and fashioned me."

The priest (or in some countries the sponsor) then anoints the other parts of the body, and, turning the child towards the East, the priest baptizes him; "The Servant of God (N) is baptized in the Name of the Father. Amen. And of the Son. Amen. And of the Holy Ghost. Amen" (*βαπτίζεται δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ (δεῖνα) εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς. Ἀμήν. Καὶ τοῦ Ὑιοῦ. Ἀμήν. Καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Ἀμήν*). At each invocation he immerses him. After the Baptism he washes his hands, singing with the people the 31st Psalm (English version the 32nd). The service concludes with the tonsure, or cutting off the hair, which is done *cross-wise.*

(II.) Unction with Chrism or Confirmation. After the third immersion the priest confirms the baptized child, anointing him *cross-wise* with the holy Chrism (*μύρον*); on the forehead, the eyes, the nostrils, the mouth, the ears, the breast, the hands, and the feet, saying: "The seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost. Amen." (*Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. Ἀμήν*). (Then follows the washing and the Psalm as above.)

The priest, with the sponsor holding the child, and with a lighted taper (signifying *the light of Christ*), walks round the Church, whilst is thrice sung, "As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on

Christ. Alleluia." The Epistle (Rom. vi. 3—14) and the Gospel (Matt. xxxviii. 16 to the end) are read; the Ectænia follows, and the congregation is dismissed.

In the early Church (and probably till the thirteenth century) imposition of hands (χειροθεσία) followed immediately after Baptism; it is probably for that reason that Confirmation, which is administered to adults, does not hold the distinct character of a Sacrament in the Anglican Church. From a passage in the Epistles of St. Gregory the Great, it is difficult to determine whether in early times presbyters could confer Confirmation. In a letter to Januarius, bishop of Cagliari [n], he writes; "Let presbyters anoint those *who are to be baptized, on the breast* (*baptizandos ungant in pectore*). In another letter to Januarius [o] he says; "We allow that where there is a lack of bishops, presbyters may touch *with Chrism even on the forehead those who are to be baptized;*" if (as is probable) in the latter passage the word *baptizandos* is loosely used for *baptizatos*, it would agree with a passage of Pope Innocent I. [p]; Confirmation might be conferred by a presbyter, with Chrism consecrated by the bishop; "presbyteris chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum."

The custom of rebaptizing converts from the Western Churches, which Roman Catholics, notwithstanding the seventh canon of the Second Œcumenical Council, still persist in, has within the last thirty years been discontinued in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The first to break through the uncatholic practice was the Greco-Russian Church, with the sanction of Jeremias III., Patriarch of Canstantinople, in 1718, soon after the institution of the Holy Governing Synod.

[n] Ep. IV. 9. [o] Ep. IV. 26. [p] Ep. I. Ad Decent. c. 3.

The Sacrament of Unction with Chrism is always administered on the admission of a Christian convert; and is not repeated, except in the case of heretics and apostates on their re-admission into the Church. The only other exception is with regard to the Tsar, who, like the Eastern Emperors in former times, is anointed for a second time at his coronation.

(III.) The Eucharist. What in the Latin Church is named the Mass (=Missag; offering), is in the Greek Church *Λειτουργία*, a word which is also applied to the service itself. Communion (*κοινωνία; μετάληψις*) in both Kinds is the practice of the Orthodox Church. The doctrine of concomitance, "*totus Christus sub utrâque specie*," led the Roman Church, from a feeling of reverence lest any of the consecrated Wine should be spilt, to adopt the uncatholic and unscriptural practice of withholding the Cup from the laity; the same feeling of reverence led the Greek Church to administer the Bread soaked in the Wine. Communion in both Kinds is in accordance with the institution of the Sacrament by Christ; and the universal custom, previously to the schism, of both Eastern and Western Churches. The practice of the Greek Church was recognized at the Council of Clermont in 1095 by Pope Urban II., who ordered it to be so administered to the sick, and in cases where there is danger of the Wine being spilt. His successor, Paschal II., revoked the order. But it was not till the Council of Constance, on June 14, 1415, that the decree was passed ordering that the Eucharist should be administered to the laity in one Kind only, that of Bread.

The withholding the Cup is opposed to the strongest declarations of the Popes themselves. Pope Gelasius (492—496), declared "divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii

sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire." Leo the Great (440—461), that those who practised it "notati et prohibiti a sanctorum societate pellantur." The Council of Clermont enacted that no one (with the exception stated above) should communicate except in the Body and Blood, separately and alike. The Anglican Church returned at the Reformation to the Catholic practice; but the Roman Church at the Council of Trent confirmed the innovation, which remains in the present day one of the chief differences between the Roman Church on the one hand and the Greek and Anglican Churches on the other.

The Greek Church calls the Pope of Rome the first *Protestant,* the founder of German rationalism. "What answer," asks the *Orthodox Confession,* "will the superstitious Pope be able to give at the dreadful day of judgment, for having, in evident opposition to the Lord, taken away the Cup of Communion from the common people?"

The bread used at the Eucharist by the Greek Church is leavened bread (ἄρτος; raised), which the Anglican Church also allows but does not insist upon [q], and the Greek Church calls the Romanists who use unleavened bread Azymites (ἀζυμῖται); and the *Orthodox Confession* continues the sentence quoted above, "and for giving them Communion only in unleavened wafers."

The Liturgy of St. Chrysostom is that in daily use; that of St. Basil is used on the Sundays of the Great Lent, except Palm Sunday; on Holy Sunday and Holy Saturday; on the vigils of Christmas Day and the Epiphany; and on St. Basil's Day. The Liturgy of

[q] The words of our Rubric are: "It shall *suffice* that it be such as is usual to be eaten."

the Presanctified is that in general use during the Great Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, and the Feast of the Annunciation, which are exempt from fasting ; it is celebrated with the elements consecrated on the preceding Sunday (hence called *presanctified*).

The Greek *Μετουσίωσις* connotes the Roman *Transubstantiatio*, the difference being such as exists between the Greek *οὐσία* and the Latin *substantia*. Neither word is primitive ; the Latin word having been first adopted at the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215. After the fall of Constantinople the Church of Rome (to quote the words of Dr. Smith, a Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who was Chaplain at Constantinople in the latter part of the seventeenth Century [r]), "took advantage of its poverty and distress to bring the Greek Church into a compliance with its doctrines, in order to bring it into subjection." "The success of Roman intrigues," says Mr. Masson [s], "may be estimated from the fact that, of the Greek ecclesiastics who from the fall of the Eastern Empire to the beginning of the seventeenth Century (a space of 150 years) filled the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople, thirteen were the tools of Rome."

Owing to such causes a Latinizing spirit showed itself in the Greek Church. The College de Propagandâ Fide, founded at Rome A.D. 1622, by Pope Gregory XV. (1621—1623), was influential in Latinizing the Church of Western Russia, many Russians who had been educated in it returning to their country imbued with Roman principles. This spirit found its way into the *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kief; Christ is said to be present in the

[r] *Account of the Greek Church.* [s] *Apology for the Greek Church.*

Eucharist *Κατὰ τὸν μυστηριώδη τρόπον*, and, *Θεὸς καὶ Ἄνθρωπος, μετουσίωσιν.*

In 1672, the word was imported into the *XVIII Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem*[t]. Christ is present, the document says (Art. 17), "truly and really (*ἀληθῶς καὶ πραγματικῶς*), so that after the consecration the bread is transmuted (*μεταβάλλεσθαι*), transubstantiated (*μετουσιοῦσθαι*), converted (*μεταποιεῖσθαι*), remodelled (*μεταῤῥυθμίζεσθαι*), into the very Body of the Lord—and the wine is converted and transubstantiated into the very Blood of the Lord. The substance of the bread and wine no longer remains after consecration, but only the very Body and Blood of the Lord, (*αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα*), under the appearance (*εἴδει*) and form (*τύπῳ*), that is to say under the accidents (*συμβεβηκόσιν*)." "By the word *μετουσίωσις*," it adds, "we cannot explain the mode of the conversion of the elements, for that is known to God alone; but they truly, really, and substantially, become the Body and Blood of Christ."

The *Confession* of Peter Mogila was approved in 1696 by Adrian, the last Patriarch of Moscow, and acknowledged in the *Spiritual Regulation* of 1720. After the reformation of Peter the Great more truly evangelical principles were re-introduced, and a return to primitive orthodoxy manifested itself in the Russian Church. Plato and Philaret, Metropolitans of Moscow, (the former of whom became Metropolitan in 1775, whilst Philaret died in 1867), were two of the most eminent prelates that have presided over the Russian Church[u]; and though their

[t] *Apology for the Greek Church.*

[u] Joseph II., Emperor of Austria, being asked what he admired most in Moscow, replied, "the Metropolitan Plato." Of Philaret, Dean Stanley said, "Never have I seen such respect shown for any ecclesiastic;—the enthusiasm of the people could not have been greater.'

teaching was cramped by the horror which exists in Russia of anything which approaches innovation, those two prelates, by their inculcation of the Scriptures, their attacks on the abuse of the veneration of Saints and images, their appeal to the faith of the undivided Church, left their mark on Russian orthodoxy.

In 1772 Plato was appointed bishop of Tver. He explained the sense in which the Greek Church accepts transubstantiation; "ecclesia catholica Orientalis admittit quidem vocem transubstantiatio (Græcè μετουσίωσις); non physicam illam transustantiationem et carnalem, sed sacramentalem et mysticam." In the same year in which Plato became bishop of Tver Dr. King wrote his *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia.* He says that the *Confession* of Peter Mogila was at that time held in little reputation, whilst with regard to the Synod of Bethlehem, for the words "*the substance of bread and wine no longer remains*," the Russian Church substituted "*the bread and wine no longer remain;*" and omitted the *accidents.*

It may therefore be inferred that the Greek Church accepts the word μετουσίωσις or transubstantiation in the *Confession* of Mogila and the *XVIII Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem*, in the sense attributed to it by Plato.

Writing of the *Confession* of Mogila Mr. Blackmore says, in his book on the Russian Church, that in 1837, 30,000 copies were printed by the Holy Synod, and that the book ran into the 12th edition; in 1845 the Synod, he says, ordered that it should be read once a week in lower schools, and that the pupils should know it before being admitted into the higher schools.

The *Articles of Bethlehem* (several points being further modified in a Russian translation made in 1838) were,

by order of the Holy Synod in 1845, to be issued gratuitously to all theological students in Russia.

The *Orthodox Doctrine* of Plato, "examined and approved," says Macarius, "by the Governing Synod," has been introduced into every theological school in Russia; it is, says Mr. Masson in the *Apology for the Greek Church*, "scriptural and evangelical" to a degree which would astonish those who form false ideas of the Russian Church.

A materialized sense in the Eucharist Philaret discouraged. The *Longer* and *Shorter Catechisms*, which are both his work, were promulgated by the Holy Synod as "*the Catechism of the Church itself.*" Though Philaret teaches that the bread and wine become *truly*, *really*, and *substantially* the Body and Blood of Christ, Christ's Presence, he says, is a mystery to be apprehended by faith, not reasoned about. "The Russian Church," says Dr. Neale, "has evidently determined to decline the use of the distinction of the *οὐσία* and the *συμβεβηκότα* in the bread and wine, which the Council of Bethlehem brought prominently forward."

In the following account of the Greek Eucharist we confine ourselves to the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, that being the one in general use. It consists of two parts, the Pro-Anaphora, corresponding to the Missa Catechuminorum, and the Anaphora to the Missa Fidelium, of the Western Church. It is preceded by the *προσκομιδή* (*προσκομίζω*), the bringing into the Prothesis of the Prosphers (*προσφέρω*), or Offerings from which the bread and wine for the Eucharist are taken. These are placed on a table, also called *πρόθεσις* (and *παρατράπεζα*). The priest and deacon entering the Bema say, "I will enter into Thy House;" and having robed themselves

go to the *χωνευτήριον*, and washing their hands, say, "I will wash my hands in innocency and so will I go to Thine Altar;" the service in the Prothesis then commences.

The Prosphers consist of five loaves, in allusion to the five loaves with which our Saviour fed the 5,000; the loaves are round, in shape like our cottage-loaves. From the top of one the priest cuts a piece bearing the fourfold inscription IS XS NI KA; or in Russian, IC XC NI KA (*Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς νικᾷ*). This is called the Seal. Into each of the four parts he thrusts a lance (*ἁγία λόγχη*); he then elevates the Seal, saying, "His life is taken from the earth;" and places it on the Paten (*δίσκος*), with the words, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world and on behalf of the sin of the world," and thrusts into it the lance, saying, "and one of the soldiers pierced His side with a lance, and straightway there issued forth Blood and Water." This then becomes the *Ἅγιος Ἀμνός* (Holy Lamb), and is the part for consecration. The deacon mixes wine and water, which the priest blesses. The remainder of the Prosphers form the *Antidoron*, and correspond to the *pain beni* of the Latin Church.

There are three Oblations. The first is that at the service of the Prothesis; the second when the Paten and Chalice are taken from the Prothesis and the Little Entrance (*ἡ πρώτη καὶ μικρὰ εἴσοδος*) is made into the Bema; the third after the Great Entrance (*ἡ δευτέρα καὶ μεγάλη εἴσοδος*).

At the completion of the service in the Prothesis the Paten is covered with a veil, beneath which is placed a bent Cross termed the Asterisk (*ἀστέρισκος*), to prevent it falling on the Bread, the priest saying the words, "And

the star came and stood over where the young child was." The Chalice is covered with another veil; whilst a third veil, called the Air (*ἀήρ*), covers both together. The Bread and Wine are blessed with a solemn prayer (*ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς προθέσεως*). The Paten and Chalice are left in the Prothesis.

The Proanaphora then commences. The deacon having received the Book of the Gospels from the priest, holding it on high so that the people may see, preceded by taper-bearers and followed by the priest, makes the Little Entrance through the middle door into the Bema, and deposits the Book of the Gospels upon the Holy Table. The Angelic Hymn follows, *"Αγιος ὁ Θεὸς, ἅγιος ἰσχυρὸς, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς* (*Holy God, holy and powerful, holy and immortal, have mercy upon us*). The Epistle and Gospel are then read from the Ambo, and the Proanaphora concludes with the dismissal by the deacon of the Catechumens (*ὅσοι κατηχούμενοι προέλθετε*).

The Anaphora then commences. The priest advancing to the Prothesis takes from under the Air the Paten and Chalice, and preceded by the deacon, who carries the Paten and the censer, and by taper and incense-bearers, himself carrying the Chalice, passes into the Nave, and the priest makes the Great Entrance through the middle door into the Bema, whilst the choir sings the Cherubic Hymn (*Ὁ Χηρουβικὸς Ὕμνος*). The Kiss of Peace (*Ὁ Ἀσπασμός*) is then given; and the Nicene Creed is sung, after which the deacon enters the Bema, and taking the fan (*τὸ ῥιπίδιον*) fans reverently the holy Gifts till the time of the Invocation. The Triumphant Hymn *"Ὕμνος ἐπινίκιος, ("Αγιος, "Αγιος, "Αγιος Κύριος Σαβάωθ*) (Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth, &c.) is sung. Then the Invocation and Consecration follow; "Send down Thy

Holy Spirit on these Gifts which lie before Thee (*ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα δῶρα ταῦτα*), and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and that which is in this cup the blood of Thy Christ, changing (*μεταβαλών*) them by Thy Holy Spirit." The priest then consecrates (*ἁγιάζει*) the Gifts. A little warm water is poured into the cup.

After the clergy have received the Bread and Wine separately, the gate of the Iconostasis is opened, or the veil withdrawn; this is meant to signify the appearance of the Saviour after His Resurrection. The Communion is then administered to the people by the priest from the Chalice, which contains the Wine and the Bread sopped in it. Some of the combined species is extracted in a spoon (*λαβίς*), and so applied to the mouths of the Communicants, who receive standing; the priest saying the words;—"The servant of God (N) receiveth the precious and holy Body and Blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of his sins and for everlasting life." The deacon wipes the mouths of the Communicants with a cloth.

The Communion ended, parts of the Prosphers which remain unconsecrated, but blessed by the priest, are distributed amongst those present, who take them home for the sick and others who have been unable to attend. This is the *Antidoron* (*ἀντὶ τοῦ δώρου*), which the absent ones receive with reverence and fasting, as a representation of the Eucharist. This service concluded, the priest dismisses the congregation with the blessing (*εὐλογία*).

The *Longer Catechism* prescribes:—"Our mother the Church calls on all to confess before their ghostly fathers, and to communicate four times yearly, or even every month." The *Orthodox Confession* requires all to re-

ceive once a year. It is the practice for priests to communicate daily.

(IV.) In the Greek Church Penance is a Mystery by which the penitent, after true repentance and oral confession and the outward absolution by a priest, is inwardly loosed from his sins by Christ Himself. It is considered necessary for all, clergy and laity alike, four times a year being prescribed by the Church, but once, at Easter, being the general practice; that being in Russia enjoined by the Civil law.

The Anglican, it may be mentioned in passing, is the only Church in Christendom whose priests receive at their Ordination the commission to forgive sins; "*Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven.*"

(V.) Under Holy Orders (ἡ Ἱερωσυνη) are comprised the three higher grades (βαθμοί) of the Episcopate, including (I.) Patriarchs, Archbishops, Metropolitans, and Bishops; (II.) the Presbyterate; and (III.) the Diaconate. In Lower Orders are: the Door-keeper (θυρωρός); the Reader (ἀναγνωστής); the Choir-man (ὕμνωδος) who leads the singing; the Sub-deacon (ὑποδιάκονος) who has charge of the ornaments and vestments.

(VI.) Marriage consists of two parts, the Espousals and the Coronation. Impediments to marriage consist; (I.) in consanguinity, which extends to the sixth degree; (II.) natural affinity, to the fifth; and (III.) Spiritual, or Baptismal affinity, to the third degree. The presence of at least one Paranymph (παράνυμφος) as sponsor is required. Crowns blessed by the priest are placed upon the heads of the bride and bridegroom to remind them of the Crown laid up in Heaven. The bride on the wedding-day is a queen and the bridegroom a king. In Russia the crowns are often of very costly material,

and are kept laid up in churches for the purpose. Eight days afterwards there is a service for dissolving the crowns. No marriage is celebrated in Lent; a second marriage (διγαμία) is disapproved of; a third marriage (τριγαμία) is opposed to the canons; a fourth marriage constitutes polygamy.

(VII.) Unction with oil differs from Extreme Unction in the Roman Church, being administered in the hope that, through the anointment of the body, the sick person may be recovered both from his bodily and spiritual ailments; whereas in the Roman Church it is only administered when recovery seems hopeless (*in articulo mortis*). The Greek Church believes that oil blessed by the bishop has a peculiar virtue in curing bodily ailments, whilst it enables the recipient to resist the temptations of the devil. In the Anglican Church the Archbishop in delivering the Bible to a bishop at his consecration enjoins him to "heal the sick."

St. James (Ep. v. 14, 15) prescribes unction in the hope of the bodily recovery of the sick person. Since he uses the plural number the Greek Church requires as the rule more than one presbyter; it adopted the number of seven in allusion to the Seven Gifts of the Spirit spoken of by Isaiah; three at least are generally required, but even that number is not rigidly adhered to, in places where two or even one presbyter only can be obtained. The presbyter anoints the sick person on the forehead, nostrils, mouth, breast, and both sides of the hands, and prays that God, "the physician of the soul, would heal His servant of his infirmity." The Holy Eucharist is then given him.

PART I.

The Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

CHAPTER I.

The Nicene Creed enacted.

In A.D. 324, Constantine I., surnamed the Great, the first Christian Emperor, united the whole Roman Empire under his government. At that time the see of Alexandria was presided over by Alexander (313—328), Antioch by Eustathius (324—331), Jerusalem by Macarius (312—336).

The last persecution fell with terrible severity on the Greek Church, one of its victims being St. Peter, Archbishop of Alexandria (301—311). In the pontificate of Peter, Arius first began to acquire notoriety[a]. A native of Libya, Arius, was educated in the famous school of Antioch under St. Lucian, who also died a martyr in the last persecution, and from Antioch he transported his heretical opinion to Alexandria. Having joined the Meletian schism he was excommunicated by Peter; returning to orthodoxy, Peter ordained him deacon, but had reason to excommunicate him again for the same offence; Peter's successor, Achillas (311—313), ordained him presbyter, and in 313 appointed him to the most important charge in Alexandria, the church of Baukalis, where he, a

[a] Sulpitius Severus (Hist. Sac. II. 35), speaks of two Ariuses.

man of fair learning and agreeable and ascetic manners, "a subtle-witted and marvellous-fine spoken man," as Hooker calls him, gained considerable popularity.

In 319 Alexander his bishop, "with perhaps too philosophical minuteness [b]," explained before a synod of his clergy the mystery of the Trinity; whereupon Arius charged him with Sabellianism, the denial of the distinction of the Three Persons in the Trinity.

The object of Arius was to defend Christianity against a charge of polytheism, the idea that Christ was a second God; and he used the metaphor of sonship. He allowed that Christ was begotten of the Father before all worlds; but as he was a son, He had a beginning of existence (*ἀρχὴν ὑπάρξεως*); and there must have been *once* when he was not (*ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν*) [c]; and it necessarily follows that He had His subsistence (*ὑπόστασιν*) out of nothing (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων*); whence his followers were sometimes called Exucontians [d].

Alexander first remonstrated with him; but finding that Arius persisted in "acting like a madman" (*κορυβαντιῶντα*) [e], and refused to retract his opinions, he, A.D. 321, in a synod, consisting of 100 bishops, at Alexandria excommunicated him, together with two Egyptian bishops, Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica, with Pistus a presbyter, who lived to be for a time intruded into the see of Alexandria, and several other presbyters and deacons.

[b] Soc. H.E. I. 5.

[c] St. Athanasius (Apol. c. Arian. I. 11) thinks that by *ποτε* he meant to evade time; "What," he asks, "was *once* when He was not?"

[d] Athan. de Syn. 31.

[e] Theod. H.E. III. i. 1; literally like a Corybant, a priest of Cybele. The Fathers frequently speak of the "Arian madmen."

Expelled from Alexandria Arius went to the Holy Land, where he enlisted the sympathy of the church-historian Eusebius, Archbishop of Cæsarea, but found opponents in Macarius of Jerusalem and Philogonius of Antioch, the latter of whom he denounced as one of his most strenuous opponents[f]. Thence he went to Nicomedia, where another Eusebius, bishop of the see and a fellow-Lucianist, in a synod of Bithynian bishops, pronounced in his favour. Availing himself of the confusion consequent on the war between Constantine and Licinius, Arius returned to Alexandria, to find himself condemned in another synod, in 324, under Hosius, bishop of Corduba (*Cordova*).

Constantine having by his victory over Licinius effected peace in the State, was disappointed at finding the Church of Alexandria rent asunder by religious strife; he considered it "in a light of a calamity personally affecting himself[g];" religious peace he held to be necessary for the consolidation of the Empire; and as it proved he thought rightly, for the Arian was the first of a series of controversies which shook the Roman Empire to its base.

As might be expected in one whose mind had been trained in war, and his life spent amongst pagans in the West, Constantine was ill fitted to grasp the subtleties of Eastern theology. Not understanding the principles at stake, caring nothing which way the matter was settled so long as there was peace and an undivided Church, he sent Hosius, whom he had found serviceable in the case of the Donatists[h], to Alexander and Arius, treating the matter as one of dialectics "insignificant

[f] Theod. H.E. I. 3.

[g] Eus. V.C. II. 63.

[h] A schism which gave rise to the Council of Arles, A.D. 314.

and worthless," such as Arius should not have broached and Alexander have taken no notice of[i].

The teaching of Arius spread rapidly throughout Egypt, Libya, and the Upper Thebais, and by degrees over the rest of the Provinces of Alexandria[k]. Had the Christian Church recognized one person as the infallible head on earth, there can be no doubt that Constantine in his love of peace would have sought his counsel. He had, when Emperor of the West, experienced the inadequacy of provincial synods in dealing with the Donatists of Upper Africa. Eusebius says[l] that Constantine regarded himself as a general bishop, appointed by God to summon synods for the government of God's Church. Acting probably by the advice of Hosius, he now called together a council of bishops of the whole Empire, to settle all matters which prevented the unity of the Church, and he selected Nicæa in Bithynia as being a central place, and in the vicinity of his palace at Nicomedia.

The first Œcumenical Council accordingly met at Nicæa and held the first session on June 19, 325. It was attended by 318, almost all Eastern, bishops. Silvester, bishop of Rome (314 — 335), was absent "on account of age[m];" but the three Eastern Patriarchs (to anticipate their distinctive title) were present; Alexander of Alexandria attended by his deacon Athanasius; who had already written a treatise *On the Incarnation*[n]; Eustathius of Antioch, and Macarius of Jerusalem. Silvester was represented by two presbyters.

Amongst the principal bishops present were;—Hosius, "whom the Emperor greatly loved and held in the highest

[i] Eus. V.C. II. 69. [k] Soc. H.E. I. 6. [l] V.C. II. 44.
[m] Soc. I. 8. [n] Athan. Apol. c. Arian. 6.

esteem [o]," who probably presided in turn with Eustathius; Alexander of Byzantium; Eusebius of Cæsarea, "the Father of Church history;" his namesake of Nicomedia; Leontius (*Castratus*), a future Archbishop of Antioch; Cæcilian, lately the subject of the Donatist controversy; the saintly Jacob of Nisibis with his pupil and spiritual son Ephrem, "the prophet of the Syrians;" Spiridon, the shepherd-bishop of Cyprus, the Patron-Saint of the Ionian Islands [p]; Paphnutius, a bishop in the Thebaid, and Confessor in the late persecution; (Theodoret says [q] "the council looked like an assembled army of Martyrs;") Paulinus of Tyre, a future Archbishop of Antioch; Marcellus of Ancyra and Asclepas of Gaza, two prominent bishops in the Arian troubles; John, "bishop of Persia and the Great India;" Theophilus, bishop of the Goths; Theognis, bishop of Nicæa; Maris of Chalcedon; Secundus of Ptolemais and Theonas of Marmarica. Acacius, a Novatian bishop, was present, invited by Constantine, says Socrates, on account of the purity of his life [r].

The Homo-ousion (*of one essence*), which Hosius claimed to have received "from the bishops who had gone before him," was, probably at his instigation, recommended by Constantine as the symbol of the Council; and it was in vain opposed by Eusebius of Nicomedia. Eusebius of Cæsarea presented the creed of his own Church, which was in substance accepted, but, because it did not contain the Homo-ousion, was not adopted, it being thought that anything short of the word would be a triumph to the Arians.

[o] Athan. Apol. c. Arian. I. 7.

[p] For an account of Spiridon, see Sozomen, H.E. I. 11.

[q] H.E. I. 6.

[r] Soc. II. 32. The Novatians, Socrates says, (IV. 9), were persecuted by the Emperor Valens for holding the Homo-ousion. By some Socrates himself is supposed to have been a Novatian.

Hosius then drew up the nucleus of the Nicene Creed [s], based on the Creed of Eusebius, which, owing to his ignorance of the Greek language, was read to the council by Hermogenes [t], the predecessor of Dianius [u] in the see of the Cappadocian Cæsarea.

The Council added the following declaration ;—"And those who affirm that there was a time when He was not ; and that before He was begotten He was not ; and that He was made out of nothing ; and who affirm that He is of a different substance or essence, or created, or subject to change or alteration, the Holy Catholic Church anathematizes [x]."

Sixteen bishops, and amongst them Eusebius of Cæsarea, objected to the Homo-ousion as Sabellian, and refused to subscribe the Creed. Eusebius soon gave way and subscribed ; but he wrote to his people at Cæsarea explaining his reason for subscribing the Homo-ousion and consenting to the rejection of their Creed [y]. The number of recusants next dwindled down to five, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Maris, Theognis, Secundus, and Theonas, all of them Lucianists, "scoffers of the word Homo-ousion [z]." Eventually all subscribed (Eusebius with a mental reservation) except the last two, who together with Arius and his two friends Euzoius and Pistus were exiled by Constantine to Illyricum. There they did much harm by propagating their opinions ; it was probably from them that Stephen, a future Archbishop of Antioch, and

[s] See Chap. III. [t] Basil, Ep. 81. [u] Ib. CCXLIV. n.

[x] "When once," says Athanasius (Orat. c. Arian. I. 35), "they have framed to themselves a God made out of nothing, and a created Son, of course they also adopt such terms as '*an alterable nature*,' and '*as being suitable to a creature*.'"

[y] Theod. H.E. I. 7. [z] Soc. I. 8.

Valens and Ursacius[a], whom we shall find amongst the most violent opponents of Athanasius, and perhaps Ulphilas, "the Apostle of the Goths," learnt their Arianism.

Eusebius of Nicomedia, (whom his subscription for a time saved, and whom Secundus had tauntingly warned of his fate), and Theognis, having offended Constantine by entertaining Arians, were, three months later, deposed and banished.

The banishment of the Arians was the work not of the Church but of Constantine, although we hear of no voice raised in remonstrance; and the consequences were sure to fall on the orthodox leaders.

The proper time for observing Easter was decided by the Council. Part of the Eastern Church, the provinces of Syria, Cilicia, and Mesopotamia[b], still celebrated the Lord's Crucifixion upon the day of the month on which it occurred, the fourteenth day of the Jewish month Nisan, whence they were called Quartodecimans (τεσσαρακαιδεκατῖται); and three days afterwards, whether it were Sunday or not, the Lord's Resurrection; whilst the Western Church commemorated the Death on Friday and the Resurrection on Sunday. At an earlier time, when Eusebius says[c] *all Asia* (a vague expression) followed the Quartodeciman practice, the difference was discussed in a friendly spirit by St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna (*mart.* c. 166), the disciple of St. John, and Anicetus, Bishop of Rome (157—168), without any agreement on the subject being arrived at. About that time a fiction, which is historically impossible, that St. Peter had been bishop of Rome, first saw the light. Acting on some supposed right derived through Peter, Victor,

[a] Sul. Sev. I. 8. [b] Athan. Ep. ad Afros. 4. [c] H.E. V. 23.

bishop of Rome (190—*mart.* 201), thought fit to force the Western practice on the Churches of Asia Minor. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, wrote to Victor that their practice was derived from the Apostle St. Philip who died at Hierapolis; from St. John who died at Ephesus; from St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna; and from various Martyrs of the Eastern Churches. Nevertheless Victor excommunicated them[d]; this we believe is the first recorded instance of excommunication. The Asiatics still continued their practice; nor did they alter it when a Western Council, (that of Arles, A.D. 314), decreed that Easter was to be kept everywhere on the same day, and that the Roman custom was to be followed. But the Nicene was almost wholly an Eastern Council; and the observance of the festival on the day on which it was kept by the descendants of the Saviour's murderers now led them to avow the Western practice[e]; the Council decreed by common consent that Easter should be kept on the next Sunday after the full moon following the vernal equinox; and the bishops of Alexandria were deputed to ascertain the exact day in each year, and to communicate it, through the bishop of Rome, to the Western Church.

A third matter brought before the Council was the Meletian schism. Egypt formed an exception to the Provinces of the Roman Empire which generally had a Metropolitan of their own; for, although divided into three Provinces, Egypt Proper, Libya, and Pentapolis, the three Provinces were ecclesiastically subject to the Metropolitan of Alexandria. Of the three Provinces, Lycopolis, of which Meletius was titular Metropolitan,

[d] Eus. V. 24; Soc. V. 22.

[e] Eus. V.C. III. 1; III. 18.

was the most important[f]. St. Epiphanius[g] speaks of Meletius as a bishop in Egypt, but subject to the Archbishop of Alexandria. He had been deposed in 306 in a synod at Alexandria under Peter for ordaining presbyters for other dioceses than his own. After that synod he headed a schism and "rebelled against the primacy of Alexandria[h]," opposing Achillas and Alexander as he had Peter[i]. Socrates[k] and St. Athanasius[l] say that Meletius was convicted of many crimes and of sacrificing to idols; this it is difficult to reconcile with the lenient sentence pronounced on him at Nicæa; though the Meletian schism was anathematized, Meletius was allowed to retain the rank of a bishop, but in lay communion, and in strict subordination to the Archbishop of Alexandria; those ordained by him were to be subjected to a further consecration (*μυστικωτέρα χειροτονία*), and to hold an inferior rank amongst the clergy. By such clemency the bishops hoped to gain the Meletians. "Would to God," wrote Athanasius, "that he had never been so admitted; for within five months, the blessed Alexander being dead, they were again troubling the Churches[m]."

Twenty canons were enacted at the Council;—Canon I. (in agreement with Apostolical Canons XXII. and XXIII.) forbade men who had emasculated themselves to be ordained; this was probably directed against Leontius (Castratus), who to guard against suspicion with regard to a female who resided with him had so treated himself. —III. (likewise directed against Leontius) forbade clergymen having in their houses a *συνείσακτος* (*subintroducta*

[f] On the extensive jurisdiction of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, see later on. [g] Hær. 69. [h] Theod. I. 8. [i] Athan. ad Episc. Æg. 23. [k] Ib. I. 6. [l] Apol. c. Arian. 59. [m] Ibid.

femina).—IV. enacted that a bishop should be appointed (*καθίστασθαι*) by all the bishops of the Eparchy (Province), or by at least three, the ratification belonging to the Metropolitan.—V. allowed appeals to Metropolitan synods, for which purpose two such synods were to be held every year, one before Lent, the other about Autumn.—VI. (probably against the Meletians) confirmed the ancient customs (*τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω*) of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; that over them the bishop of Alexandria should have jurisdiction, "as was the custom with the bishop of Rome;" (ut vel ille Aegypti vel hic suburbicarum ecclesiarum solicitudinem gerat[n]). By the same canon Antioch and the other Provinces (*ἐπαρχίαι*) were to possess their rights (*πρεσβεῖα*); the Provinces referred to being probably Ephesus and Cæsarea, of the latter of which Eusebius was bishop, and which included Jerusalem, where Macarius was bishop.—VII. (probably at the instance of Macarius) gave a special privilege to Ælia (Jerusalem), *τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς*, the dignity of the Metropolis (Cæsarea) being preserved; the saving clause being probably due to Eusebius.—VIII. treated the Cathari or Novatians, who only differed from the Church on points of discipline, as leniently as the Meletians were treated; but their bishops could only be regarded as Chorepiscopi; "for in the same city there shall not be two bishops."—XIII. ordered that Communion should be given to all dying persons, including those under penance.—XV. and XVI. forbade the translation of clergymen.—XVI. (in agreement with Apostolical Canon XXXVI.) forbade a bishop to ordain in another's

[n] Rufinus says (H.E. I. 6) *suburbicarian* means "in the vicinity" of Rome.

Diocese without his permission. These two last canons, as far as they concern the translation of bishops, never were and probably were not intended to be universally applied; but only where translations might cause disorder; the XIVth Apostolical Canon (whether before or after Nicæa) forbade translations "without just cause." Sozomen says (I. 1) that Eustathius went to Nicæa as bishop of Berœa (Aleppo), and that the bishops were so sensible of the purity of his life that they translated him to Antioch. Socrates speaks [o] of the frequent translation of Bishops; and St. Gregory Nazianzen places the two Nicene canons amongst *νόμους πάλαι τεθνηκότας* [p].

Canon XIX. ordered the Paulianists (the followers of Paul of Samosata), who did not baptize in the name of the Trinity, to be rebaptized [q]. — XX. enacted that on the Lord's Day and in the days of Pentecost all should pray standing [r].

An attempt was made at the Council to introduce clerical celibacy into the Church. In the early Church voluntary celibacy was encouraged; but the Vth Apostolical Canon enacted;—"Let not a bishop, presbyter, or deacon put away his wife on pretence of religion; if he do so let him be suspended from Communion, and if he persist let him be deposed." The earliest council which dealt with clerical marriages was that of Illiberis

[o] VII. 36. [p] Carm. 1810—1811.

[q] Paul, Archbishop of Antioch, was heretical on the Trinity, and having been condemned in two councils at Antioch (264 and 269) was deposed.

[r] This included the Holy Communion, at which standing had always been the practice. The Puritans of 1604 pleaded this canon as an excuse for themselves. But the early Church (like the Greek Church in the present day) *stood to express its reverence;* the Puritans to detract from the importance of the Sacrament; moreover they received not standing but sitting.

(Elvira) in Spain, A.D. 306, of which the XXXIIIrd canon runs; "Placuit prohibere episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconis, vel omnibus positis in ministerio abstinere se a conjugibus suis et non generare filios." The canon clearly means that the clergy might have wives, and only refers to their mode of intercourse with them, as is expressed in the heading of the canon, "De episcopis et ministris ut ab uxoribus abstineant."

Marriage after Ordination was forbidden to a presbyter by canon I. of Neo-Cæsarea, (perhaps A.D. 315), and by X. of Ancyra (about the same time) to a deacon unless the latter announced before Ordination his intention to marry. Spiridon, who was present at Nicæa, was married and had children[8]. Socrates calls the law proposed at the Council, that the clergy should not live with their wives whom they had married when laymen, *a new law*. It found an opponent in Paphnutius, who was himself unmarried, and had from his early youth been a resident in a monastery (ἀσκητήριον). He insisted on the tradition of the Church (τὴν ἐκκλησίας παράδοσιν); that such clerics as were unmarried when they entered on their sacred calling should continue so, but that none should separate from a wife whom he had previously married. This reasoning the whole council confirmed; it was endorsed by canon IV. of Gangra, A.D. 340; and canon XIII. of the Trullan Council, which St. Ambrose, writing probably from memory, ascribes to the Council of Nicæa (Ep. 63), settled the rule for the Greek Church, forbidding the clergy to contract second marriages, but allowing presbyters and deacons to retain their wives.

In July of the year of the Council Constantine visited

[8] Soc. I. 11.

Rome, where he celebrated his Vicennalia; and his visit was a turning-point not only in the history of the Church but of the world. Whilst he himself witnessed with contempt the debased type of Pagan superstition which met him everywhere at Rome, in the Senate and amongst the nobles; the Roman people openly displayed their resentment of his long absence from the capital, his preference for Eastern dress and Eastern customs, as well as for the Christian religion, which they had in vain endeavoured to stamp out; so, after a few days, he left the city never to return, with the fixed determination of building a New Rome in the East, which should be Christian from its foundation [t].

From Nicæa bishop Macarius returned to Jerusalem. Shortly afterwards Constantine's aged mother, Helena, started on a journey to the Holy City, the Emperor having instructed Macarius to supply her with ample funds for the erection of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which was to surpass in magnificence all other churches in the world [u]. Helena having ordered the removal of the débris which Pagans had heaped up to obliterate the site, and Hadrian's Temple of Aphrodite to be destroyed, the Holy Sepulchre was brought to light; this she ordered to be detached and to be enclosed in a magnificent Church, now known alas! as the Mosque of Omar.

A tradition of the fifth Century ascribes to St. Helena *the Invention of the Cross*. In the Western Church *the Invention of the Cross* is commemorated; but in the Eastern Church the *Staurophaneia* commemorates the recovery of the Cross from the Persian Emperor Chosroes

[t] Eus. V.C. III. 48. [u] Ibid.

by the Emperor Heraclius. Since neither Eusebius nor the Bordeaux pilgrim who visited Jerusalem in 333 mentions the circumstance, the discovery of the Cross by St. Helena is at least open to doubt.

We will, however, continue the narrative as it has been handed down. Part of the Cross she sent to Constantine together with the nails; one of the nails he placed in his helmet; another on his bridle; whilst a piece of the Cross he is said to have sent to the recently converted King of Iberia (Georgia).

St. Helena also dedicated other Basilicas in the Holy Land; one at Bethlehem to commemorate the Nativity; another on the Mount of Olives, the Resurrection; and a third on the sacred Terebinth at Mamre, which had been profaned by heathen hands.

It was till lately usual to infer from a passage in Athanasius[x], that Alexander of Alexandria died five months after the Council of Nicæa. It has, however, been clearly established, through the discovery of the *Historia Acephala* and the *Festal Letters* and *Index* of Athanasius himself, that that passage refers, probably to the renewal of the Meletian schism, but, certainly not to the death of Alexander. In one of those Letters it is stated that Alexander died on the day and month corresponding to April 17, 328, and that Athanasius was consecrated on June 8 of the same year[y]. Designated by Alexander on his death-bed, elected by the unanimous voice of the Orthodox bishops and clergy, but against a powerful opposition of Eusebians and Meletians, Athanasius endeavoured to avoid consecration by flight, but his place of concealment being discovered he was

[x] Apol. c. Arian. 59.

[y] See the Letters in P.N.F.

brought back, and involuntarily became Pope of Alexandria [z].

The long tragedy of his episcopate is thus summed up by Hooker:—"The heart of Constantine stolen from him; Constantius using every means to torment him which malice and his sovereign power could invent; no rest under Julian; as little under Valens; crimes of which he was innocent laid to his charge; his accusers and judges being the same persons; bishops and prelates finding it unsafe to befriend him and falling away from him. During the space of 46 years, from the time of his consecration till the last hour of his life in this world, they (the Arians) never suffered him to enjoy the comfort of a peaceable day." He has descended to posterity as "the Father of Orthodoxy;" and it may well be doubted whether, but for him, Semi-Arianism, instead of the Nicene faith, might not have triumphed in the East.

In 327 Constantine's half-sister, Constantia, died at Nicomedia, where she had been brought under Arian influence by its bishop Eusebius, who with Theonas was probably the first to return from exile, both being reinstated in their sees [a]. Socrates relates that Constantia on her death-bed commended to Constantine her Arian chaplain, who, prompted by Eusebius, obtained the recall of Arius; Arius, probably in 330, was allowed to return to Alexandria, on signing a creed from which the Homo-ousion was omitted, but which satisfied the Emperor; Athanasius refused to admit him to Communion [b].

On May 2, 330, took place the dedication, on the ruins of Byzantium, of New Rome or Constantinople, which Constantine made the capital of the Roman Empire.

[z] Soz. II. 14. [a] Soc. I. 23. [b] Soz. II. 22; Athan. Apol. c. Arian. 59, 60.

Eusebius probably returned to Nicomedia shortly after the consecration of Athanasius, and thenceforward became the head of the advanced Arians, who after him were now called Eusebians. Reasonable people, like Eusebius of Cæsarea, who held the *via media*, were ready to condemn the ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων (*from nothing*) of the Eusebians, and to accept the faith of Nicæa; but they demurred at the word Homo-ousion. Athanasius himself drew a distinction between those who radically differed from the Council and "those who only doubted about the co-essential [c]," which he says was adopted by the Council as destructive of the Arian catchwords, such as "created," "alterable," "He was not before His generation [d]."

Constantine was soon disillusioned of his idea of producing unity, and an inevitable re-action set in against the Nicene Creed; especially was this the case amongst the bishops of Syria and Asia Minor, of whom the Nicene Council had been principally composed.

At the Council of Nicæa, Orthodox and Arians were agreed that the true doctrine of the Son of God was to be found in the Bible; Athanasius says [e] the object of the Council was to gather together the meaning of the Bible (τῶν Γραφῶν τὴν διάνοιαν). The controversy which followed shows that the Eastern mind had to be educated to understand a word which is not to be found in the Bible. And yet the word Homo-ousion, to which so much objection was taken, was no new one invented by the Fathers of Nicæa [f], but a word already in existence, although used in different senses. This is evident from a work

[c] De Syn. 41. [d] De Dec. 20. [e] De Decretis.
[f] Theod. H.E. I. 12.

of Athanasius, entitled *De Sententiâ Dionysii*, written in defence of Dionysius, his great predecessor (247—265) in the see of Alexandria, whom the Arians claimed as agreeing with them.

At an Alexandrian synod in 261 Dionysius, in dealing with Sabellianism, certainly used the broadest subordinationist expressions. He spoke of the Son as *ξένον κατ' οὐσίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς—ὡς ποίημα ὢν οὐκ ἦν πριν γέννηται.* His namesake the Pope of Rome synodically condemned his language, and published a Treatise affirming the true doctrine of the Homo-ousion, with which Dionysius of Alexandria then expressed his agreement. The Eusebians now accused him with having used those words. "Yes," says Athanasius [g], "he did write it; we admit that his letter runs thus;" but, he says, the passages ought to be taken in conjunction with his own letters, from which "it is evident that he wrote the suspected passages *in a qualified sense*" (*κατ' οἰκονομίαν*).

Openly to attack the Nicene Creed would be a dangerous proceeding, so the policy adopted by the Eusebians was: (I.) to get rid of the leading Orthodox bishops; (II.) by establishing a formula without the Homo-ousion to pave the way for the suppression of the Nicene Creed.

The great post-Nicene controversy had its origin in a quarrel between Eustathius of Antioch and Eusebius of Cæsarea, Eustathius accusing Eusebius with perverting the Nicene Creed; Eusebius charging him with Sabellianism.

"Eustathius was," says Athanasius [h], "sound in the faith and hated the Arian heresy, and would not receive

[g] De Sent. 4. [h] Hist. Arian. 1.

those who adopted its tenets;" Theodoret calls him[i] "the champion of piety and chastity." Eusebius of Nicomedia having been, when on a visit to Antioch, hospitably entertained by him, invented against Eustathius a foul accusation. This was brought forward by the Eusebians in their self-constituted synod at Antioch; he was further accused of Sabellianism (a charge frequently brought against the Orthodox), and with insulting the Emperor's mother[j]; and was deposed and exiled to Illyricum, Constantine assuring the synod that "they had cast out that which defiled[k]."

No council ever re-instated him, and he died in exile about A.D. 337; but so beloved was he at Antioch, that a lamentable schism in the Orthodox Church of Antioch, lasting more than eighty years, was the consequence of this unjust act.

The Eusebians availed themselves of the deposition of Eustathius to appoint Eudoxius, "a sybarite in luxury as well as a heretic in faith[l]," whom Eustathius had rejected for unsoundness of doctrine, bishop of Germanicia[m].

There is much uncertainty as to the succession of the Archbishops of Antioch at this time. Paulinus, to whom Eusebius devotes the tenth chapter of his History, translated from Tyre, the cathedral of which he restored with great magnificence, probably followed Eustathius; and was an Arianizer. After his short episcopate of six months Eulalius, chosen by the Eusebians, only survived his appointment three months. The Eusebians then appointed Euphronius (332—333); after whose

[i] H.E. II. 23. [j] Hist. Arian. I. 4; an allusion to the rumour that Helena was an Inn-keeper's daughter. [k] Ibid. [l] Theod. II. 23. Athan. Hist. Arian. 4.

death the see was offered to, but refused by, Eusebius of Cæsarea on canonical grounds. Flaccillus or Placitus, an Arian, was then appointed (333—342).

The Eusebians commenced their attacks on Athanasius in 332. To specify minutely the unfounded charges of immorality, sacrilege, murder, witchcraft, which were brought against him, would be a useless waste of time and space; one charge may suffice as a specimen of all. The Eusebians, in league with the Meletians, who were now under the leadership of John Arcaph, the successor of Meletius, accused him of having murdered and cut off for magical purposes the hand of a Meletian bishop named Arsenius; and Constantine, in 334, convened a synod at Cæsarea to investigate the charge. Athanasius, knowing that Eusebius, the bishop of Cæsarea, bore him no good will, refused to attend the council, and convinced Constantine of the absurdity of the charge. But the Eusebians still persisting, the Emperor ordered the bishops, on their way to Jerusalem for his Tricennalia and the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, to stop at Tyre, the capital of Phœnicia, and there to hold a council, which he peremptorily ordered Athanasius to attend.

The Council of Tyre met in the summer of 335 under the presidency of Flaccillus, and was attended, in addition to about 50 of Athanasius' own bishops, by 60 bishops, mostly his enemies; the two Eusebii, George of Laodicæa, Maris, Theognis, Valens Bishop of Mursa in Pannonia, and Ursacius of Syngidon (Belgrade), the two leading opponents in the West of Athanasius, who now appear upon the scene for the first time; whilst Maximus of Jerusalem (336—351) and Marcellus of Ancyra were doubtful friends. The synod was marked from the first

by disorder and confusion. The Meletians were his accusers, the Eusebians his judges, and Eusebius of Cæsarea sat as president. Potamon, an aged Egyptian Bishop[n], who had lost an eye in the last persecution, and died a Confessor at the hands of the Eusebians under Constantius, tauntingly asked Eusebius; "Were we not together in prison in the time of persecution? How comes it that you escaped without betrayal of the Lord's cause, when I was thus maimed for upholding it? or how come you to sit as judge on the innocent Athanasius[o]?

A hand purporting to be that of the murdered Arsenius was brought forward in a wooden box by the Eusebians. He had been sent into hiding at a monastery by John Arcaph; but growing weary of his confinement, he took up his residence in a private house at Tyre, where he was recognized by his old acquaintance the bishop of the see, and was now introduced by Athanasius with both hands intact. But it was of no avail; scandal succeeded scandal; charges of witchcraft and immorality with a consecrated virgin were brought against Athanasius, and when he disproved them, they threatened him with death[p]. A commission was despatched to Alexandria to manufacture accusations against him, and so threatening was the attitude of his enemies that the civic authorities dragged him away and hurried him on board a ship. On the return of the commissioners further charges were brought against him.

Athanasius was determined to lay his case before the Emperor, and set sail in an open boat for Constanti-

[n] Epiph. Hær. LXVIII. 7.

[o] The Egyptian Bishops in their Encyclical of 338 assert that Eusebius had been accused of sacrificing to idols.

[p] Theod. H.E. I. 28.

nople [q]. He thought his absence would bring the sittings of the council to an end, and that *ex parte* proceedings could not stand [r]. So far from this being the case, they, after his departure, passed sentence against him, the dead-alive Arsenius, as he calls him, subscribing his condemnation.

Athanasius, now in Constantinople, sought out the Emperor, whom he met as he was entering the city in state. Constantine thought him at Tyre; he was the last person whom he expected or wished to see, and he tried to avoid him. Athanasius was not to be put off, and demanded that either a fresh synod should be held, or his accusers brought face to face with him in the presence of the Emperor; as he insisted that he only asked for justice, the demand was one which Constantine could not refuse.

The bishops had gone from Tyre to Jerusalem, where the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre took place on September 13; at the Dedication Festival the Eusebians acquitted Arius and admitted him to Communion [s]. At Jerusalem they received an order from the Emperor to repair as speedily as possible to Constantinople to justify their conduct at Tyre [t].

Alarmed at the sudden change in the Emperor, all but six bishops hurried away to their Dioceses. These six were Athanasius' greatest enemies; Eusebius of Nicomedia, Theognis, Maris, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, Valens, and Ursacius. A council was held at Constantinople, where, instead of defending their conduct at Tyre, they abandoned their former charges, invented a fresh calumny well suited to incense the Emperor, and accused

[q] Festal Index, 8. [r] Apol. c. Arian. 82. [s] Ib. 84. [t] Soz. I. 34.

Athanasius with forbidding the exportation of corn from Alexandria, the principal granary in the Empire. How could he, Athanasius asked, a poor man in a private station, do such a thing[u]? The Emperor affected to believe the charge, and Athanasius expected the usual sentence for such an offence, death; but, he says[v], the Emperor was moved to mercy and sentenced him to banishment to Treves. At the council Constantine banished John Arcaph for "causing divisions."

The Eusebians had a grudge against Marcellus of Ancyra for not having sided with them at Tyre and Jerusalem. They *now* deposed him on a charge of having written a book countenancing the views of Paul of Samosata, and Basil, a Semi-Arian, was appointed bishop of Ancyra (336—360)[x].

At Treves Athanasius was received with great honour by St. Maximin the Bishop; and there he made a friendship which afterwards stood him in good stead, that of Constantine's eldest son and successor, Constantine II. In vain the famous hermit-saint Antony interceded for him: the Emperor wrote to him that Athanasius was the cause of dissension and sedition, and that so many prudent and excellent bishops could not be wrong[y].

Arius having been acquitted at Jerusalem, ventured to return to Alexandria, where the people refused to communicate with him. Alexandria being too remote, and Athanasius too much beloved for him to use compulsion there, Constantine summoned Arius to Constantinople, and ordered Alexander, the bishop, to admit him to Communion. Alexander, who had been a staunch supporter of Orthodoxy at Nicæa, and was now venerable

[u] Apol. c. Arian. 9. [v] Ib. 6. [x] Soc. 36. [y] Ib. II. 31.

with nearly 100 years of age, told the Emperor that he could not receive the heresiarch. In vain the Eusebians threatened him with deposition; but the danger was averted; on the eve of the Sunday on which Arius intended to present himself, he, an old man of eighty years, suddenly expired. In the same year Alexander died; and on Whit-Sunday in the following year died Constantine, having deferred his Baptism till the last in the hope, as he said, of being baptized in the waters of Jordan[z]. The Roman story about his being baptized by Pope Silvester is worthless; he was baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, and buried by his son Constantius in the Church of the Holy Apostles which he had lately completed at Constantinople. Whether or not he lived and died an Arian, it is impossible to decide; neither his Baptism nor the banishment of Athanasius is sufficient to determine the question; he received Baptism from the bishop of his own see; he was an admirer of Athanasius; he acknowledged that he was "a man of God," and that he preached "saving knowledge[a];" he banished him just as he did John Arcaph, because he believed him to be the disturber of the peace.

Alexander, on his death-bed, "enjoined the proper persons to choose one of two whom he named[b]" as his successor; if they wanted a man of piety, Paul; if one with an outward show of piety, Macedonius[c]. Macedonius, who was afterwards the parent of the heresy which bore his name, had the support of the Eusebians; but the orthodox party in an endemic synod (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*), at a time when Constantine was absent from Con-

[z] Eus. V.C. 62. [a] Apol. c. Arian. 7. [b] Soc. II. 6.
[c] Soz. III. 3.

stantinople, elected and consecrated Paul. This was an infringement of the right of the Metropolitan of Heraclea, and one of the last acts of Constantine was to depose Paul and banish him to Pontus[d].

Constantine the Great was succeeded by his three sons; Constantine II., the eldest, having Gaul, Spain, and Britain (337—340); Constantius, the second (337—361), who in the words of Gibbon "inherited the defects without the abilities of his father," having the East and eventually the whole Empire; and Constans Italy and Africa (337—350).

Constantius, who was an Arian, bore throughout his whole reign a bitter hatred against Athanasius. No successor having been appointed to Paul, one of the first acts of Constantius was to summon a synod to Constantinople, to depose him a second time, and send him in chains to Singara in Mesopotamia[e]. Macedonius was not appointed to the see; but Eusebius, who had before been translated from Berytus to Nicomedia, was now (338) translated to Constantinople.

In 338 the hermit Antony, "the Father of asceticism," who had before visited the city during the persecution of Maximin[f], re-visited Alexandria; and although he only remained two days (July 25—27) "he showed himself wonderful in many ways," says Athanasius[g], telling the people that Athanasius taught the true doctrine, and denouncing Arianism as the precursor of Anti-Christ[h].

Constantine II., an orthodox Emperor, carrying out the intention of his father[i], who, he said, had banished Athanasius to keep him out of danger, restored him,

[d] Athan. Hist. Arian. 7. [e] Ibid. [f] Vita S. Anton. 46.
[g] Festal Ind. 10. [h] Theod. IV. 24. [i] Apol. c. Arian. 87.

contrary to the advice of Eusebius[j], to Alexandria, where on November 23, 338[k] he "was most joyfully received by the people of the city."

The Eusebians did not long leave him in peace; in the next year they supplanted him by one Pistus, who, with Arius, had been excommunicated in the Alexandrian synod of 321; and Pistus was consecrated Archbishop of Alexandria by Secundus of Ptolemais, who together with him had been deposed at Nicæa.

The Eusebians sent to Rome three envoys with fresh charges against Athanasius, and requested Pope Julius (337—352) to call a council in the hope that it would condemn Athanasius and confirm the appointment of Pistus. Athanasius held a synod consisting of nearly 100 bishops at Alexandria, by which a solemn encyclical addressed to "the bishops of the whole world" was drawn up, setting forth the plots against him and justifying his conduct. The Eusebians ashamed of their nominee Pistus now withdrew him, and Eusebius of Emesa having declined the appointment, they elected an "Anti-Pope," Gregory (339—344), "a monster of Cappadocia," St. Gregory Nazianzen calls him[l], who on March 22 was forcibly intruded into the Patriarchate by his fellow-countryman, the Prefect Philagrius.

In April Athanasius, attended by two monks and a few of his clergy, started for Rome, where he was soon joined by Paul, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepas of Gaza. At Rome he remained upwards of three years[m] (May, 339—432), during which time, through his enthusiasm for the monk Antony, the presence of the monks who accompanied him, and other types of monastic saint-

[j] Theod. I. 30. [k] Fest. Lett. 10. [l] Orat. II. 13.
[m] Apol. ad Constan. 4.

liness, Athanasius created so strong an impression in its favour that he is regarded as the Father of Western monachism.

Pope Julius acceded to the request of the Eusebians and sent envoys to Antioch to invite them to a council which he had arranged at Rome. But, finding that Athanasius was at Rome[n], and feeling that the council would be a purely ecclesiastical one, at which no Count would be present nor soldiers stationed at the doors[o], they refused to attend, and after detaining his envoys some months at Antioch, sent them back with a discourteous reply to the Pope.

The Pope's council met at Rome in November, 340, and was attended by more than fifty bishops (we do not find at this time attending the council of a Pope of Rome the hundred bishops that a Pope of Alexandria could summon to his councils); Athanasius, Paul, Marcellus, and Asclepas were acquitted; and Julius wrote a courteous letter to the Eusebian bishops, claiming no exclusive rights to himself, but upbraiding them, in the name of the Italian bishops, for their discourtesy and refusal to attend the Roman council[p].

The Eusebians having declined, the Western council availed themselves of the opportunity offered by the dedication, in 341, of the Golden Church at Antioch, commenced ten years before by Constantine the Great, to hold a council of their own (the council *in Encæniis*), with the object, says Socrates[q], of getting rid of the Homo-ousion. No Western bishop, no representative of the Pope was present. The council was attended by

[n] Apol. c. Arian. [o] Hist. Arian. II.
[p] The letter is given Athan. c. Arian. 2. [q] II. 8.

Constantius, and ninety-seven bishops, mostly from the Patriarchate of Antioch, under the presidency of the Arian Flaccillus, and was nearly equally composed of Orthodox and Eusebians.

St. Hilary, who lived at the time of the council, and was (350—367) bishop of Poitiers, calls it "a synod of Saints[r]." It would appear that at that time the Nicene Creed, although the true faith was firmly held, attracted little attention in the West; Hilary says[s], "I never heard of the Nicene Creed before I was going into banishment;" i.e. till 356. He saw that Arian practice was not at variance with Orthodox practice; that Orthodox and Arians had the same Sacraments, the same Baptism, the same Eucharist; and his belief was that before he had heard either word he "would have interpreted Homoi-ousion by Homo-ousion[t]." Hilary would not therefore at that time have appreciated the crucial question between Athanasius and the Eusebians, nor be in a position fully to understand the nature of the council.

The Dedication Council published four creeds, all of a vaguely orthodox character, but from all of which the Homo-ousion was omitted. The most important was the second, "The Dedication Creed," supposed to be the Creed of the Martyr St. Lucian, which thenceforward became the Creed of the Semi-Arians. This Creed was capable of the orthodox sense in which Hilary accepted it. The omission of the Homo-ousion would not have struck the Western as it did the Eastern mind, nor as Hilary understood it later on; and it was Hilary's object to show that the Eastern Creeds since Nicæa were orthodox; till he came to the "Blasphemy of Sirmium."

[r] Hil. de Syn. 32. [s] De Syn. 91. [t] Ibid.

The council passed twenty-five doctrinally unobjectionable canons, canon I. making a respectful reference to the Council of Nicæa. Canons XI. and XII. forbidding appeals from synods to the Emperor, were pointedly directed by the Eusebians against Athanasius. Constantine II. had reinstated him; but Constantine was dead, killed in 340 in battle with his brother Constans. The council took high ground, and it gave a retrospective effect to the new canons; as Athanasius had been deposed by a synod he could only be reinstated by the same authority; it confirmed the sentence of Tyre, and Constantius sanctioned his deposition. What were the orthodox Bishops doing? It has been surmised that the Eusebians had all along outwitted them; that to gratify their orthodox colleagues they had consented to orthodox Creeds and orthodox canons; and that when the friends of Athanasius, thinking the council ended, had returned to their Dioceses, the Eusebians continued a *conciliabulum* and enforced the new canons.

On the death, in 340, of Eusebius the historian, the Eusebians appointed to the see of Cæsarea a bishop of a much more strongly pronounced Arianism, Acacius (340—366; the "one-eyed;" μονόφθαλμος); and when, in 341, Eusebius of Constantinople died, Acacius succeeded him in the leadership of the Arian party. Paul was now restored to Constantinople; but riots occurring there between his followers and those of Macedonius, in which the General Hemogenes was killed and his body dragged through the city, Constantius riding at full speed from Antioch deposed Paul: this was his third deposition; and he was banished to Armenia[u]. Mace-

[u] Hist. Aceph. 2.

donius had been consecrated by the Eusebians, but Constantius, offended with his part in the riots, would not allow him to occupy the see, although he might minister in the church at Constantinople in which he had been consecrated [x].

Constans, who through the death of his brother Constantine became sole Emperor of the West, favoured the orthodox party; and in May, 342, summoned Athanasius from Rome to meet him at Milan; there he informed him that he had written to Constantius proposing that a council should be held to remedy the disorders in the Church. From Milan Athanasius went to Treves, where he met Hosius, who informed him that the place agreed upon was Sardica (the modern Sophia), as being conveniently situated both for East and West; and that a General Council would meet there in the following year.

The bishops both from East and West accordingly repaired to Sardica (*the rugged* [y]). But the Eusebians, learning that Athanasius and Marcellus had been judicially acquitted at Rome, and fearing that they would be again acquitted, at once raised an objection, and refused to attend a council to which they and their other opponents would be admitted. They were told that it was a General Council, and that a fair hearing would be accorded to both sides. As they still persisted, two rival Councils met about the end of 343, one under Hosius at Sardica, consisting of about ninety-four, almost entirely Western, bishops, with Athanasius and a few Eastern bishops, Julius being represented by two presbyters; the other at Philippopolis, consisting of Eastern, a large majority

[x] Soc. II. 13. [y] Soc. II. 20; Soz. III. 12. Socrates, but apparently wrongly, places the council in 347.

of whom were Eusebian, bishops, and a few Westerns, altogether seventy-six in number, under Stephen (342—344), the Arian successor of Flaccillus in the see of Antioch. Thus the character of the Sardican Council, which the Emperors had intended to be a General one to reconcile the Orthodox and Eusebians, was completely altered.

The Sardican Council confirmed the Nicene Creed. It found that Arsenius was still alive, and that that and the other charges against Athanasius were false; and acquitted and restored him, as well as Paul, Marcellus, Asclepas and their brethren; it deposed Basil the successor of Marcellus, Stephen of Antioch, Theodore of Heraclea the consecrator of Macedonius, Acacius of Cæsarea, George of Laodicea, whom Athanasius calls the worst of the Arians [z], Ursacius and Valens. As to Gregory "who had been sent to Alexandria by the Emperor they proclaimed that he had never been made a bishop, and that he ought not to be called a Christian [a]."

The pseudo-synod of Philippopolis, which assumed the title of Sardica, retaliated by excommunicating Julius, Hosius, Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepas, Paul, Maximin, and their associates; and drew up a creed of a more Arian character than the Dedication Creed. Its Encyclical Letter stated that "a vast multitude had congregated at Sardica of wicked and abandoned persons from Constantinople and Alexandria, who lay under charges of—all nameless sacrileges and crimes [b]."

The Sardican Council, owing to the rival Council of Philippopolis, was a purely Western Council, nor were its canons, twenty-one in number, though drawn up in

[z] Lett. 47. [a] Hist. Arian. 17. [b] Hil. Frag. III. 9.

Greek and Latin, ever received into the code of the Catholic Church; and Du Pin asserts that they were never accepted in the East. That the council could not have been one of much weight may be inferred from the fact that St. Augustine knew nothing of it, or confused it with the pseudo-Sardican Council; for he writes: "Sardicense concilium fuit—contractum maximè contra Athanasium[c]." After the council Socrates says "the Western Church was severed" (by which he must mean *temporally* severed) "from the Eastern[d]."

The Council failed in the purpose intended by the Emperors of effecting a reconciliation; so far from being reconciled, the Arians themselves became split up into two parties; the original Arians, and the Semi-Arians, the latter under the leadership of Basil of Ancyra. Eustathius of Sebaste, and Eleusius of Cyzicus, with the Homoi-ousion (*of like substance*) as their symbol.

Some consequence attaches to the Sardican canons (which more than one Pope cited as Nicene) inasmuch as they gave rise to the appellate jurisdiction claimed by the Popes of Rome. The synod of Antioch forbade a bishop to appeal beyond his own Metropolitan; canons IV. and V. of Sardica, referring only to deposed bishops, allowed a bishop who had been deposed by his Metropolitan to appeal to Pope Julius, who might, if he thought proper, write to the bishops of the neighbouring province to re-hear the case, or at the request of the bishop send his presbyter to sit in judgment with appointed bishops. It is evident that the council gave the Pope some power which he did not possess before, and it could not

[c] Quoted from Bright's "Roman See in the Early Church," 86 n.
[d] II. 22.

in any case bind the Greek Church. As it mentions Julius by name it was personal to him; and the reason is obvious. Julius had given an asylum to two heads of the Greek Church, and extended to them and other orthodox prelates justice which it was impossible at the time to obtain elsewhere.

The council adopted the fourth Creed of the Dedication Council, with an addition which from its prolixity was called the Macrostich (*μαχρόστιχος*[e]). It sent to Constantius two envoys, Vincent, bishop of Capua, and Euphrates of Agrippina, to obtain his confirmation of its decisions and leave for Athanasius to return to Alexandria. The discovery of a diabolical plot on the part of Stephen of Antioch to blacken the character of Euphrates led to the summoning in the summer of 344 of a synod at Antioch in which Stephen was deposed, and Leontius (*Castratus*), whose appointment was protested against as opposed to the first canon of Nicæa, a man of doubtful orthodoxy, was appointed Archbishop of Antioch (344—357).

After the council an order was given to the magistrates that if Athanasius, in consequence of his acquittal, should venture to return he should be put to death, and a terrible persecution of the Orthodox at Alexandria took place[f]. Athanasius first took up his residence at Naissus in Dacia, and in 345 at Aquileia[g], where he was received by Constans.

On June 26, 345, Gregory, the intruded Pope of Alexandria, died[h]. Constantius, led by the conduct of the Arian Stephen to fear that a general plot had been laid

[e] Soc. III. 11. The Creed is given in Athan. de Syn. 26.
[f] Hist. Arian. 19. [g] Fest. Lett. 15, 16. [h] Ib. 18.

against the Orthodox party [i], determined on the release of the exiles of Alexandria. He wrote two letters to Athanasius, requesting him to visit him with a view to his restoration. Athanasius hesitated till he received a third and more pressing invitation. On his way he visited Julius at Rome who received him very kindly and gave him a nobly-worded letter of congratulation to the Church at Alexandria. He next visited Constance at Treves, and then went to Antioch, where he was cordially received by Constantius, who affirmed that he would never again listen to accusations against him [j]. From Antioch he went to Jerusalem, where Maximus, the bishop, summoned a council of the bishops of Palestine, who gave him a letter to the bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laity of Alexandria, "sheep scattered and fainting without their shepherd." On October 21, 346, he entered Alexandria, "the people and those in authority meeting him a hundred miles off [k]."

Now he entered on the *Golden* period of his episcopate, and was left in comparative peace for nearly ten years (346—356) [l]; the Eusebians thought their cause lost, and Valens and Ursacius wrote to Julius and Athanasius, anathematizing Arianism, and asking the forgiveness of and Communion with Athanasius [m].

In 350 the Orthodox cause suffered a disastrous blow through the murder of Constans in an insurrection under the usurper Magnentius, who, in order to strengthen his cause, tried to gain to his side Athanasius and the persecuted Nicene party [n].

[i] Theod. II. 9; Athan. Hist. Arian. 21.

[j] Hist. Arian. 22.

[k] Fest. Ind. 18.

[l] Nine years three months and nineteen days. Hist. Arian. 2.

[m] Apol. c. Arian. 58.

[n] The charge of having corresponded with "the tyrant" Athanasius indignantly denied. Apol. ad Const.

In 351 Maximus, the honest but vacillating Bishop of Jerusalem, died. He had been a Confessor in the Diocletian persecution [o]; was orthodox, though wavering, at Nicæa; was gained over by the Eusebians at the Tricennalia at Jerusalem; returning to orthodoxy, but conscious of and fearing his weakness, he absented himself from the Dedication synod at Antioch; and thus maintained his orthodoxy to the last.

He was succeeded by St. Cyril (351—386). To attempt to reconcile the conflicting statements as to Cyril's appointment would be a hopeless task. Socrates [p], whom Sozomen follows [q], says that the Arians "Acacius and Patrophilus, having ejected Maximus, established Cyril in his see." Cyril's opponent, St. Jerome, says [r] that Acacius and the Arians permitted him to be made a bishop on condition of his renouncing his ordination by Maximus. On the other hand the synodical letter of the Council of Constantinople of 382, which sat during Cyril's episcopate, says that he was "some time ago elected (*χειροτονηθέντα*) canonically by the bishops of the Province;" and "that he had in several places fought a good fight (*πλεῖστα ἀθλήσαντα*) against the Arians [s]."

Marcellus though acquitted at Sardica was never reinstated in the see of Ancyra; and in 350 Basil, who proved one of the best of the Semi-Arians, was restored by order of the Emperor. The accounts of Marcellus are conflicting. He was orthodox at Nicæa, and he boasted of the friendship of Julius and Athanasius [t]; but we find St. Basil [u] cautioning the latter against him; and Sulpitius Severus says [x] that Athanasius condemned him as a heretic and suspended him from Communion.

[o] Theod. H.E. II. 21. [p] II. 38. [q] IV. 40. [r] Chron. ann. 349. [s] Theod. V. 9. [t] Hieron. Vir. Ill. 86. [u] Ep. 69. [x] II. 37.

He lived till A.D. 374, and became an object of suspicion to Orthodox and Arians alike.

The heresy of his pupil Photinus is thus described by St. Vincent of Lerins; (Commonit. XII. 33). "He denies the completeness of the Trinity, and does not believe there is any Person of God the Word, or any Person of God the Holy Ghost. Christ he affirms to be a mere man, whose origin was from the Virgin Mary." He was condemned (in company with Marcellus) in the Macrostich as *σκοτεινός* not *φωτεινός*. Two synods were held at Sirmium, where he was Bishop, one in 349, the other, under the presidency of Basil of Ancyra in 351, in the latter of which Photinus was deposed and banished, dying in exile in 366.

Julius of Rome, the staunch friend and supporter of Athanasius, was now dead, and Liberius was Pope (352—366). Athanasius at Alexandria was regarded by Constantius as a formidable opponent; and it now became his object to weaken him by detaching the bishops from his side. At a time when the fundamental difference between Homo-ousion and Homoi-ousion was not fully realized in the West[y], Constantius determined to gain over, if necessary by force, the Western bishops to his side. For that purpose two Western councils were held, the first, in October 353, at Arles, under its Eusebian Archbishop Saturninus, "a violent and factious man" "who was afterwards cast out of the Church for his crimes[z]." Liberius sent to the council an embassy headed by Vincent of Capua; Valens and Ursacius forbade all discussion, and insisted on the condemnation of Athanasius; he was accordingly condemned almost unanimously,

[y] Hil. de Syn. 91.

[z] Sul. Sev. II. 40 and 45.

the papal legates joining in his condemnation; Paulinus of Treves, who had before boldly championed his cause [a], again remaining steadfast, and being in consequence banished to Phrygia.

The second council met in 355 at Milan, at the request of Liberius, who thought thus to undo the work of his legates at Arles, and was presided over by Dionysius, the Orthodox bishop of the see. It consisted almost entirely of Western bishops, the Easterns being hindered from attending by the infirmities of age, or by distance [b]. The council was a kind of Western Latrocinium; "Who," to use the words of Athanasius himself [c], "can adequately describe the enormities they perpetrated?" In vain the bishops insisted that the charges against Athanasius were unfounded, invented by his accusers as a means of corrupting the faith; they were silenced by Valens and Ursacius; Constantius terrorized the Council; "My wish is a canon" he exclaimed (*ὅπερ ἐγὼ βούλομαι τοῦτο κανών*) [d]. The council supported the Eusebians and confirmed the condemnation of Athanasius, Dionysius "subscribing the condemnation on condition that there should be an investigation amongst the bishops as to the true faith [e]."

Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and Dionysius, who rejoined the catholics, were amongst the prelates who were deposed, Eusebians being intruded into their sees [f]. Hilary of Poitiers, after a council at Beziers under Saturninus, was banished to Phrygia. Constantius sent into banishment to Sirmium his father's friend, the great

[a] Sul. Sev. II. 39.

[b] Soc. II. 36; Soz. IV. 9. When they say 300 bishops attended, it is that 30 is meant. [c] De Fug. 4. [d] Hist. Arian. 33.

[e] Sul. Sev. II. 39. [f] Hist. Arian. 54.

Hosius, nearly a hundred years of age and a bishop for more than sixty years; "that Confessor most glorious in his old age (*εὐγερότατος*) and faithful[g];" a man who perhaps in his generation was as high an authority in the theological world as Athanasius himself; "What Council can be mentioned," asks Theodoret, "in which he did not preside and convince all present by the power of his reasoning?" Liberius of Rome, refusing to comply with the Emperor's order and renounce Communion with Athanasius, was banished to Berœa.

Dionysius in his exile prayed that he might die rather than return to witness the troubles of the Church[h]. His prayer was granted; he died in banishment in 374, and was succeeded in the see of Milan by Auxentius, an Arian from Cappadocia[i].

In 357 Constantius visited Rome, where the people had elected Felix in place of Liberius. Constantius issued an edict that after the liberation of Liberius, which he promised to effect, he and Felix should be recognised as joint-Popes; but the Orthodox clergy stood by Liberius, and an overwhelming shout arose, "one God, one Christ, one bishop."

[g] Theod. II. 12. [h] Ambros. Ep. 63. [i] "An intruder rather than a Christian." Hist. Arian. 75.

CHAPTER II.

The Church's Victory over Arianism.

It was not to be expected, after the councils of Arles and Milan, that the Arians would long leave Athanasius at rest. Whilst, on February 9, 356, he and his clergy were keeping their midnight vigil in St. Theonas' at Alexandria, Duke Syrianus surrounded the church with more than 5,000 troops; the doors were broken down, and the soldiers poured in with the purpose of arresting him. Calmly seated on his episcopal throne and expecting certain death, he ordered the deacon to read the 136th psalm, each verse of which concludes with the words "For His mercy endureth for ever." The soldiers made their way to the chancel. In vain Athanasius was implored to leave the church; he refused to do so till one and all were safe; eventually, in the tumult and darkness, the monks dragged him half-stifled from the church; "in a miraculous manner," he said, he escaped [a].

Now commenced his third exile. From that night he disappeared from Alexandria, and for six years (356—362) lived in unsuspected concealment amongst the monks of the Thebaid. In vain Constantius, now under the influence of Basil of Ancyra, sought him out in all parts of the Empire. Thinking that he might have taken refuge in Abyssinia, he wrote to the Princes of the country to give him up, "as a man who was guilty of ten thousand crimes [b]." An anti-Pope George, an Acacian of Cappadocia, who had been a fraudulent contractor

[a] Apol. ad Con. 25; Hist. Arian. 5; Fest. Ind. 28. [b] Apol. ad Con.

of stores at Constantinople, was during the season of Lent, 356[c], intruded by an armed force into his see[d], in which he showed himself a stranger alike to morality and humanity. Such was the man to whom Constantius requested the young Princes of Abyssinia to send Frumentius, whom Athanasius himself had consecrated first bishop of Axum[e], in order that he might unlearn what he had been taught by Athanasius, and be instructed in the knowledge of the true God.

In 357 Leontius, the weak Archbishop of Antioch, who favoured the Eusebians from, it was said, a love of peace, died, having on his death-bed uttered a presentiment of the evils which were coming on the already sorely troubled Church of Antioch; raising his hands to his white hairs he exclaimed, "When this snow is dissolved there will be plenty of mud!" He was succeeded by Eudoxius of Germanicia, who has been handed down to posterity as, in general esteem, "the worst of the Arians;" who now "fraudulently[f]," without election by the Bishops[g], and the consent of the Emperor[h], "installed himself" as Archbishop of Antioch (357—360).

In the same year Cyril of Jerusalem was deposed in a synod under his metropolitan Acacius; then followed his first banishment, during which he found an asylum at Tarsus with its Semi-Arian bishop Silvanus.

The victory of the Eusebians was now well-nigh complete. An Anti-Pope, Felix II. (355—358), presided over the see of Rome; two other important sees in the West, Arles and Milan, were in possession of Eusebians; the majority of the Eastern bishops were at

[c] Athan. De Fugâ 6. [d] Hist Arian. LI. 75; De Syn. 37.
[e] Ruf. H.E. I. 9; Soc. I. 19. [f] Soc. II. 37. [g] Soz. IV. 13.
[h] Theod. II. 21.

least in sympathy with them; and the Nicene Creed was almost universally suppressed in the Eastern Church.

At the very time when Arianism was carrying all before it, it wrecked its own cause. We have had hitherto to deal with two sections of Arians, the Eusebians, the followers of Eusebius of Constantinople, the root and branch opponents of the Nicene faith; and the Semi-Arians or Homoi-ousians, many of whom, as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, only differed from the orthodox party in not accepting the fulness of the Nicene definition. But now another party, owing its origin to Acacius of Cæsarea, came into prominence, which rejected both the Homo-ousion and the Homoi-ousion, and taught that the Son was like the Father; whence they were called Homœans. Another party owed its existence to Aetius, a former pupil of Leontius of Antioch, from whom he in 350 obtained deacon's orders; Aetius and his pupil Eunomius, a Cappadocian by birth, only carried Arianism to its logical conclusion by teaching that the Son is unlike (*ἀνόμοιος*) the Father; whence they were called Anomœans, or after their co-founder, Eunomians. Cassian's account[i] that they denied the equality but allowed the likeness of the Three Persons in the Trinity, is not strictly correct. To this party Acacius of Cæsarea for a time attached himself: and this must be the party to which Athanasius refers[k];—"Gradually going from bad to worse they have .... become godless on all heads, so as neither to acknowledge Him as God, nor to believe that He has become Man." Sozomen says[l] that they were the first to discontinue trine immersion, and that they re-baptized

[i] I. 2. [k] Letter 60. [l] VI. 26.

those who went over to them; in which heretical practice they are followed by Romanists in the present day.

Although through the favour of Eudoxius, when, in 360, he became Archbishop of Constantinople, Eunomius was appointed to succeed Eleusius at Cyzicus (360—364), Constantius and the Semi-Arians, as well as the Arians generally, except the extremists of the type of Eudoxius, Valens and Ursacius, were horrified at the blasphemy of the Anomœans; who, finding no others willing to go to their lengths, separated themselves and formed a distinct sect, which eventually gave the death-blow to the Arian cause.

Constantius, whose sympathies were generally on the side of the Semi-Arians, was swayed from time to time by the various forms into which Arianism was broken up, and now he put himself under Eudoxius. Induced by Valens and Ursacius he, in 357, convened an Arian synod, the Second of Sirmium. There an heretical formula, the Second Creed of Sirmium (the *Blasphemy of Sirmium*, as Hilary of Poitiers called it), was drawn up[m]; it laid aside the Ousia and the Homo-ousion as unscriptural terms, and declared "there is no question that the Father is greater than the Son .... in dignity and majesty." This Creed Hosius, worn out by old age and "stripes and tortures," was, says Socrates[n], "constrained by force" to subscribe; "he consented," says Sozomen[o], "to refrain from the use of the words Homo-ousion and Homoi-ousion." He was then allowed to return to Spain, living to abjure the Arian heresy, and to caution others against it[p].

To such an alarming height had Eunomianism, under the tutelage of Eudoxius, attained, that, in consequence of a letter from George of Laodicea setting forth the

[m] Hil. De Syn. 11. [n] II. 26. [o] IV. 12. [p] Hist. Arian. 45.

great danger with which it threatened the whole Church, Basil of Ancyra, in the spring of 358, brought the subject before a Semi-Arian synod assembled, on the occasion of the dedication of a church, in that city. The synod confirmed the Homoi-ousion and formulated twelve anathemas against all who rejected it. A delegation under Basil was despatched to Constantius bearing a synodal letter anathematizing the Anomœan doctrine, and requesting that the dogma might be confirmed that "the Son is of like substance with the Father."

Constantius, who now threw over Eudoxius, wrote to the Church of Antioch that he had been appointed Archbishop without his authority. Being now reclaimed to the Semi-Arians he, in 358, summoned a synod, the Third of Sirmium, which was attended by the Semi-Arian delegates from Ancyra, and the bishops resident at the Court of Sirmium. To attend the Synod he summoned Liberius from Berœa. The Emperor, says Sozomen[q], "urged Liberius to confess that the Son is not of the same substance with the Father." Liberius, of whom Athanasius spoke as the hater of Arianism[r]; who so nobly defied the synod of Milan, and went into banishment rather than abandon the faith, officially subscribed an Arian formula, and the condemnation of Athanasius; he held Communion with the Arian leaders, and acknowledged their orthodoxy. He was then released from banishment and returned to Rome, and in August, 358, was restored to his see. Of his fall, as to which Roman Catholic writers are generally agreed, there can be no doubt[s]. The charitable silence of

[q] IV. 14. [r] Ad Mon. 35.

[s] Bishop Hefele stands alone in opposition to Natalis Alexander, Tillemont, Fleury, Du Pin, Ceillier, Montfaucon, Coustant, Möhler, Döllinger, and Newman. App. to Hefele's Councils, vol. II.

Socrates, Theodoret, and Sulpitius Severus cannot weigh against the most positive assertions. Athanasius twice speaks of it; "he did not endure to the end the sufferings of banishment[t];" "he from fear of threatened death gave way[u]." Even though those works were published before the banishment of Liberius, there can be no doubt that they were republished with the additions made by Athanasius himself. St. Jerome, one of the Fathers of the Latin Church, is another witness against Liberius; "Liberius was induced to subscribe to heresy[x]."

No words can be plainer or stronger than the language of Hilary of Poitiers; "Anathema to thee Liberius—again and a third time anathema, thou prevaricator Liberius[y]."

Constantius now, with a view to restoring peace amongst the discordant Arians, determined to call a General Council, first Nicæa and then Nicomedia being chosen as the place of meeting. The latter city having been devastated by an earthquake, in which its Semi-Arian bishop, Cecropius, lost his life, Valens, fearing that a General Council would unite the Homo-ousians and Homoi-ousians, prevailed on the Emperor, through Acacius, to split the council into two parts, the Western bishops to meet at Ariminum or Rimini, where he himself would be present, the Easterns at Seleucia, where Acacius would be the leading spirit.

The Council of Rimini (to call it by that name) met, probably under Restitutus of Carthage, in May, 359, and was attended by 450 bishops (of whom about 80 were Arians), from Africa, Italy, Spain, Gaul, Britain, and

[t] Apol. c. Arian. 89. [u] Hist. Arian. 41. [x] Vir. Ill. 97.
[y] Frag. VI. 6.

Illyricum, for all of whom the Emperor ordered free lodgings and provisions (*annonas et cellaria*), which were only accepted by those from Britain [z]. Valens and Ursacius presented a formula lately drawn up at a conference at Sirmium, entitled the *Dated Creed* [a], which they required the bishops, in the Emperor's name, to subscribe. The majority pleaded that they had not gone there because they wanted a Creed, and that they were contented with the Creed of Nicæa; they rejected the formula; approved the decrees of Nicæa; anathematized Arianism; and deposed Valens and Ursacius.

Delegates were deputed by each party to convey the decision of the council to the Emperor at Constantinople. The orthodox delegates were refused an audience, and were first ordered to repair to Hadrianople, but afterwards to Nikè in Thrace. There the Eusebian delegates rejoined them, and imposed upon them an equally objectionable recast of the Dated Creed; and returning with them to Rimini, with an order from the Emperor that the bishops should not separate till they signed it, they forced on the council the formula of Nikè [b]. Dreading retention during the winter months; cajoled and out-manœuvred by Valens and Ursacius, who assured them that there was only a difference of words, they abandoned the Ousia and Homo-ousion and set their names to the uncatholic formula.

The Eastern Council met at Seleucia, the capital of Isauria, in September of the same year, under the presidency of Acacius, and was composed of about one hundred and sixty bishops, the large majority of whom

[z] Sul. Sev. 41. [a] Soz. II. 37; Athan. De Syn. 8.

[b] The formula is to be found in Athan. De Dec. 30.

were Semi-Arians. A few orthodox bishops from Egypt were present, and Hilary of Poitiers, furnished with a conveyance at the public expense, was brought from his banishment in Phrygia. The Arians having accused him of Sabellianism, he was first called upon to give an account of his faith, and was then allowed to take his seat at the council [c].

Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Macedonius were prominent amongst the Semi-Arians; Acacius, George of Alexandria, who had been expelled by the populace, and Eudoxius of Antioch amongst the extreme Arians, who numbered thirty-two adherents. At the outset the council was divided into two hostile factions, the Anomœans and Semi-Arians hurling mutual anathemas against each other. Acacius proposed the rejection of the Nicene, and the adoption of the Dated, Creed; and, taking umbrage at its rejection, left the council. Cyril of Jerusalem, having been deposed by an Arian synod under Acacius, had appealed to the civil power; his case was brought before the council, but owing to the absence of Acacius no formal decision was arrived at, and Cyril resumed the see. In the end Acacius, George of Alexandria, and Eudoxius, with several bishops of less note, were deposed by the combined forces of the Orthodox and Semi-Arians. In November George was restored to Alexandria by order of the Emperor.

Ten delegates, amongst whom were Basil of Ancyra and Eustathius of Sebaste, were deputed by the majority to convey the minutes of the council to the Emperor at Constantinople, Basil the Great being summonod from his solitude at Pontus to accompany them.

[c] Sul. Sev. II. 42.

From Seleucia Acacius went to Constantinople, where, by throwing over the Anomœans and making a scapegoat of Aetius, who was degraded and banished, he contrived to gain to his side the chief men of the Palace against Basil of Ancyra and the Semi-Arians. Having thus separated himself from the Anomœans he created a fresh sect called after him Acacians.

Constantius, still bent on combining all the conflicting sections of the Arians, with the exception of the Anomœans, ordered a fresh council to meet, in January, 360, at Constantinople. At this council Ulphilas, "the Apostle of the Goths," was present [d]. The council was wholly under the influence of Acacius. The creed of Nikè-Rimini was confirmed; the Homo-ousion as well as the Homoi-ousion rejected; the Homœan adopted; and the Anomœan anathematized. Basil the Great, when called upon to subscribe the heretical creed, left the council and retired to Cæsarea. The council deposed and banished the Semi-Arians, Basil of Ancyra, George of Laodicea, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Eleusius of Cyzicus.

From Seleucia Eudoxius also went to Constantinople, where he took part in the council of 360, and circumvented the deposition of the Semi-Arian Macedonius, for whom his irregularities, as well as his violence and cruelty, had gained universal detestation; and his own appointment to the see of Constantinople. Macedonius now became the leader of the Semi-Arians, and it was after his deposition, and apparently to relieve his solitude, that he matured the heresy with which his name is associated.

In February, 360, St. Sophia's at Constantinople, which Constantius had commenced in 342, was dedicated.

[d] Soc. IV. 4.

Eudoxius and Acacius now set themselves to obliterating all traces of the Nicene faith, and forced the Creed of Nikè-Rimini on several both Eastern and Western bishops; amongst the former being Gregory, bishop of Nazianzus, the father of St. Gregory Nazianzen, and Dianius, bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, the friend of St. Basil the Great[e]. Well might St. Jerome exclaim[f], "Ingemuit totus orbis et se esse Arianum miratus est." Athanasius wrote[g]: "The whole Church everywhere is mourning; every city groans; aged bishops are suffering in exile, and heretics dissembling, who, while denying Christ, have made themselves publicans, sitting in the churches and exacting revenue."

Meletius of Berœa was appointed by a synod in 361 to succeed Eudoxius in the see of Antioch, both the Eustathians and Eusebians regarding him as their adherent; no sooner, however, was he appointed than he announced his orthodoxy; he was then deposed and banished, and Euzoius, the former friend of Arius, appointed. Never before nor since was the Church so near a general apostacy, when in November, 361, Constantius died, having, like his father, deferred his Baptism till the last, and then receiving it from the Arian Euzoius.

He was succeeded by Julian (361—363), commonly known as the apostate. His early education Julian had received from the Arian Eusebius, when bishop of Nicomedia; but though outwardly a Christian and even ordained a Reader (ἀναγνωστής) in the Church of Nicomedia, he was probably never one at heart. Having before him the example of his cousin Constantius, the murderer of his (Julian's) relatives, and the slave of his own eunuchs;

[e] See p. 85. [f] *Against the Luciferians.* [g] Fest. Lett. 50.

having witnessed the constant changes in the Arian creeds, which elicited the Pagan taunt that Christians had still to learn in what their faith consisted; Christianity had no attraction for him; and although during a short stay in the schools of Athens, he had the society of Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzen, and even read with them the Scriptures[h], it was too late to eradicate his early impressions; and after for a time simulating Christianity, he apostatized as soon as he became Augustus.

Julian was, says Socrates[i], "eminently distinguished for his learning." Paganism, which flattered his intellect, he openly professed; but it was not the old effete paganism which, though it still continued to be the established religion of the Empire, excited the contempt of every reflecting person; but paganism reformed on the principles of Neo-Platonism and the Gospel. Christians he derided as Galileans and Atheists; nor could he understand people abandoning the religion of philosophers to follow that of fishermen.

Unlike his predecessor he was a strong, and generally a just and tolerant, Ruler. The exception was with regard to Christianity, to which, except in the Arian form, he was particularly averse. He was especially tolerant of the Jews, whose Temple at Jerusalem, in the hope of falsifying our Saviour's words, he set about rebuilding. St. Cyril was at the time bishop of Jerusalem, and he foresaw the certainty of its failure[k]. The Pagan philosopher Ammianus Marcellinus describes what happened; —"Fearful balls of fire breaking out near the foundations, with re-iterated assaults, and several times burning the

[h] Bas. Ep. 40. [i] III. 1. [k] Soc. III. 20.

workmen, rendered the place inaccessible; and by frequent repulses under the determined fury of the elements (*elemento repellente*), the undertaking had to be abandoned." But, says Theodoret, "like Pharaoh he hardened his heart."

About the same time the Delphic oracle was destroyed by lightning, and the death-blow given to the oracular divinations of the Pagans.

Julian recalled the exiled bishops, but only from a feeling of contempt; he knew that the Orthodox bishops had been exiled under persecution by the Arians; and he felt, if they returned, Orthodox and Arian bishops would renew their quarrels, and so advance the cause which he had at heart.

By every means short of death, which he knew from history had conduced to its growth, he determined to eradicate Christianity. He wrote against it; "the sons of Galileans" were forbidden to hold civil or military offices, or to follow the military or legal professions; and the Christian monogram he removed from the Labarum. Thinking to force the Christians into pagan schools he forbade them to teach Greek and Latin, for, he said, "we are being shot with shafts feathered from our own wing[l]."

Naturally of a gentle and benevolent disposition (which he made his boast[m]), he received with sorrow and indignation intelligence of the cruel death of George of Cappadocia, the Anti-Pope of Alexandria, whom the Pagans, as soon as one of their own religion ascended the throne, had, on December 24th, atrociously murdered in the streets

[l] Theod. III. 4.

[m] Bas. Ep. 40. The authorship of the Letter is however doubtful.

of Alexandria. The Arians appointed as his successor, Lucius, a presbyter ordained by George; but under the general amnesty Athanasius returned, and was again seated on the Evangelical throne. The "divine Meletius" was soon again restored to Antioch; Basil to Ancyra; and the other exiled bishops to their respective sees.

Eusebius of Vercelli and Lucifer of Cagliari were amongst the returning exiles. Eusebius went to Alexandria, and acting on his advice, Athanasius (the violence of the Arians having in his opinion abated)[n] held at Alexandria a synod, which, although consisting of only 21 bishops, was of great importance; with two principal objects in view;—to heal the schism in the Orthodox Church of Antioch, and to bring back the Arians to the Church. Two deacons represented the presbyter Paulinus, the highly respected head of the Eustathian party at Antioch.

The council decided that Paulinus ought to unite with the Meletians. Nothing could have been wiser or more conciliatory than the course advocated by Athanasius with respect to the Arians. Many had turned Arians for a set purpose (*οἰκονομία*), lest through persecution and their banishment, their flocks should be left without a shepherd; others had been deceived or had suffered violence[o]. Nothing more was to be required of them than "to anathematize the Arian heresy, to confess the faith of the holy Fathers at Nicæa, and to anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature and separate from the essence of Christ[p]."

The good results of the Alexandrian synod were at

[n] Fest. Lett. 55. [o] Ibid [p] Athan. Tom. ad Ant.

once apparent both in the East and West, but more especially in the West, where Arianism now almost entirely disappeared.

Meanwhile the zealous but headstrong Lucifer had, without stopping at Alexandria, gone from his place of exile in the Thebaid direct to Antioch, where, not recognising Meletius, because his election had been effected through the Arians, he fomented the long existing schism by consecrating Paulinus bishop (362—388); much to the distress of Eusebius, when, accompanied by Asterius, bishop of Petra in Arabia, he arrived at Antioch, bearing the letter of the Alexandrian synod, the *Tome* of Athanasius.

The act of Lucifer was on all grounds unfortunate. Not only did it accentuate the schism at Antioch, but it created a bad feeling between East and West, Paulinus having the support of the Western, and Meletius (generally) that of the Eastern, Church. It was the secret of the apathy of Pope Damasus and the Western bishops, when Basil the Great again and again implored their assistance in carrying out the great object of his life, the restoration of Orthodoxy in the Eastern Church. Basil asked them to condemn the Arians, but with the Arians he combined Paulinus[q]. It was a cause of the alienation of two great Fathers of the Church, SS. Basil and Jerome, the latter favouring Paulinus. Nor could Athanasius himself, who had before communicated with them, entirely shake off old ties with the Eustathians. Basil was asking more than Athanasius could do, when he begged his assistance in healing the schism by the recognition of *the God-beloved* Meletius[r]; and it appears from

[q] Bas. Ep. 263. [r] Ep. 67.

a letter of Basil [s] that Athanasius, probably by his recognition of Paulinus and the Eustathians, offended Eusebius of Vercelli.

Lucifer now stood aloof from the moderate party of Athanasius, and declared that he would not hold communion with Eusebius, nor with any one who supported the peaceful course of the Alexandrian synod; and Eusebius, to avoid a quarrel with his old friend, immediately left Antioch. Lucifer by his rigourism created a fresh schism of those who after him were called Luciferians, who exercised the same exclusiveness as the Donatists and Novatians of the early Church, and the Puritans of modern times.

The Pagans represented to Julian that Athanasius had dared to baptize Greek ladies, and that if he were allowed to remain, there would not be a Pagan left in Alexandria. Julian declared that he had sanctioned the return of the bishops to their fatherland, not to their sees; and he sentenced Athanasius to death [t], commuting the sentence to one of banishment. Athanasius assured his grieving people that "it was a little cloud and would soon pass;" and on October 23, 362, he left Alexandria by boat for the Thebaid.

Finding that he was being pursued, Athanasius ordered the steersman to reverse the helm. "Where is Athanasius?" said a voice. "Not far," was the reply, perhaps of Athanasius himself [u]; and he returned to Alexandria, taking up his abode in the neighbourhood of Thereu [x]; and when the danger was past, in the Upper Thebaid.

On June 26, 363, Julian was killed in war with the

[s] Ep. 89. [t] Theod. III. 5. [u] Soc. III. 14.

[x] Hist. Aceph. 11; perhaps Chereu, the first landing-place from Alexandria. Vita S. Anton. 86.

Persians, with, according to Theodoret, the words on his lips, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean[y]."

On hearing of Julian's death Athanasius returned secretly by night to Alexandria[z]. Julian was succeeded by his General Jovian (June 27, 363—Feb. 16, 364), who signalised his short reign by the ignominious surrender of Nisibis, the birth-place of St. Ephrem Syrus, and the bulwark of the East, to the Persian King Sapor.

From Nisibis Jovian went to Antioch, where he peremptorily dismissed an Arian deputation which waited on him; he wrote to Athanasius authorizing him to resume his duties, and asking for instruction in the Catholic faith. Athanasius had already held a council at Alexandria, the synodal Letter of which, explaining the Homo-ousion, condemning Arianism, and "the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost[a]," he took with him to Jovian at Antioch; returning to Alexandria in February, 364, to hear of the death, a few days afterwards, of Jovian, who had openly announced his adherence to the Homo-ousion[b].

His successor, Valentinian I. (364—375), was himself orthodox, but having repudiated his wife Severa, he took as his second wife Justina, an Arian, whom he compelled to accept the Nicene faith. He had already, in the reign of Julian, shown a marked contempt for Paganism; and in his reign Paganism, discountenanced in the towns, took refuge in the villages (*pagi*), whence it derived its name which we have anticipated, Paganism (*the peasants' religion*). Valentinian took the Western division of the Empire, and appointed his brother Valens Augustus of the East (364—378).

[y] H.E. III. 20. [z] Hist. Aceph. 13; Fest. Lett. 35.

[a] An allusion to the heresy of Macedonius. [b] Soz. III. 24.

Valens was, says Theodoret [c], at the commencement of his reign "distinguished by his fidelity to Apostolic doctrine;" he was led into Arianism by his wife, and was baptized by Eudoxius, who "bound the unhappy man by an oath" to expel the orthodox bishops; and Valens proved a worse persecutor of Orthodoxy even than Constantius.

When Valentinian on his way to the West was passing through Thrace, the Semi-Arians, desirous of undoing the work of the Constantinopolitan Council of 360, asked his permission to hold a council. Valentinian told them that such matters appertained to the Church, and that his place was among the laity. The council was held in 365 at Lampsacus on the Hellespont, and was presided over by Eleusius of Cyzicus; it annulled the decrees of the Acacian Council; condemned Acacius and Eudoxius, and confirmed their deposition; it rejected the creed of Nikè-Rimini; and accepted the Dedication Creed [d].

On May 5, 365, Valens issued an edict for the banishment of all bishops who, having been banished by Constantius, were restored under Julian. It was contended that this could not apply to Athanasius, for that he had been banished by Julian, and returned under Jovian. The imperial officers were deaf to reason; Athanasius, warned that danger threatened him, left Alexandria; and for four months (Oct. 5, 365—Feb. 1, 366) lay concealed in his country house on the New River [e].

This was his last exile. Valens, apprehensive of an insurrection, gave the order for his return, "to preside over the churches without molestation;" and public officers were sent to escort him in state to Alexandria,

[c] H.E. IV. 11. [d] Soc. IV. 4. [e] Hist. Aceph. 16; Fest. Lett. 37.

where he was left in peace till his death, a period of more than seven years.

In 366 Acacius of Cæsarea died. A long contest for their rights (πρεσβεῖα) had been going on between him and Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril claiming precedence on the ground that Jerusalem was an Apostolic See[f], Acacius on the VIIth canon of Nicæa; twice the victory fell to Acacius, which was followed on both occasions by the banishment of Cyril. On the death of Acacius Cyril claimed the right of appointing to the metropolitan see, and, in 367, appointed his own nephew Gelasius (367—395), a holy and learned man, and the continuator of Eusebius' History. In 367 Cyril was banished by Valens, and remained in exile till the reign of Gratian.

On the death of Eudoxius in 370, Demophilus (370—380), who had induced Pope Liberius to join the Arians, was translated to Constantinople from Berœa.

In the same year (370) eighty orthodox bishops, who had presented a petition to Valens imploring him to adopt a more tolerant course, were put on board ship, as if to be conveyed into banishment; when the sailors set fire to the vessel, which they then themselves safely abandoned, the bishops to a man perishing in the flames.

On May 3, 373, the great Athanasius, at the age of 76, and after an episcopate of 45 years, died peaceably in his own palace at Alexandria. He has bequeathed to the Church an interesting summary of the exact duration of his five banishments, and the six quiet periods of his episcopate; the former consisting of 17 years, 6 months, and 20 days; the latter of 22 years, 5 months, and 10 days[g].

[f] Soz. III. 24.

[g] Hist. Aceph. 17.

Peter II., at the request of Athanasius consecrated his successor, was, after blasphemous orgies in the Church of St. Theonas, immediately ejected by a band of Jews and Pagans, and Lucius intruded into the Patriarchate by Euzoius, who had travelled to Alexandria for the express purpose. Peter then went to Rome at the time that Damasus (366—384), the friend of St. Jerome, was Pope; there he remained till 378, when Valens, in consequence of his troubles with the Goths, put an end to the persecution.

On the death of Euzoius in 376 the Arians translated to the See of Antioch Dorotheus, the Metropolitan of Heraclea, the friend of Demophilus, the Arian bishop of Constantinople.

In the year of St. Athanasius' death, St. Jerome, the greatest of the Latin Fathers, went to the East, where he spent the latter years of his life (386—431) at Bethlehem. The year after the death of Athanasius, St. Ambrose (374—397) succeeded the Arian Auxentius as Archbishop of Milan; and two years before the death of Ambrose, St. Augustine, a third Father of the Latin Church, became bishop of Hippo (395—430). These three Fathers were, in the West, the great champions of the Faith, in succession to St. Hilary of Poitiers, who died in 368.

In the East the mantle of Athanasius fell on "the three Cappadocians," St. Basil the Great, Archbishop of Cæsarea (370—379), "our beloved Basil and a true servant of God[h];" his brother Gregory, bishop of Nyssa (372—395), called at the second Council of Nicæa "the Father of Fathers;" and Gregory Nazianzen "the Theo-

[h] Athan. Fest. Lett. 62.

logian," bishop of Sasima (372), of Constantinople (381). Peter, a younger brother of the two former, succeeded Eustathius as bishop of Sebaste (380—c. 392). The grand-parents of the three brother-bishops were Confessors in the last persecution; and their sister Macrina is commemorated as a Saint in both the Greek and Latin Churches.

It would be difficult (says Socrates[i]) to decide whether to give the pre-eminence to Basil or Gregory Nazianzen.

Basil the Great, born A.D. 330, having, after a five years' residence, left, in 356, the schools of Athens, where he had for his fellow-students the future Emperor Julian, and Gregory Nazianzen, adopted with considerable success the profession of rhetoric; was baptized by his beloved friend Dianius, Archbishop of Cæsarea (340—362); and shortly afterwards embraced, first at Annesi, where his mother Emmelia and his sister Macrina were living in solitude, and afterwards at Pontus, the monastic life, which had been introduced into Asia Minor by Eustathius of Sebaste. Finding the prevailing monastic system too individual and selfish, and at variance with his idea of Christian love, he instituted the cœnobitic life, the austerity which he practised probably contributing to his early death; and together with Gregory Nazianzen drew up the Rule which has ever since been that of the Greek Church.

In 359 Basil, as before stated[k], went to reside at Cæsarea, where he was much distressed to learn that Dianius subscribed the Creed of Nikè-Rimini, taken to Cæsarea by George of Laodicea after the synod of 360; this caused a coolness on the part of Basil, who went in

[i] IV. 26. [k] See p. 74.

consequence to Arianzus; returning, however, to Cæsarea to attend in 362 the deathbed of Dianius, who convinced him that he had subscribed under a misapprehension, and satisfactorily established his orthodoxy. In 364 Basil was ordained presbyter by Eusebius, the successor of Dianius, and in 370 was himself consecrated Archbishop of Cæsarea.

Gregory Nazianzen, a native of Arianzus, derived the title by which he is familiarly known from the neighbouring town of Nazianzus, of which his father, also named Gregory, was bishop (329—374); whilst Gregory's mother Nonna is commemorated as a Saint both in the Greek and Latin Churches. Having received his early education at Cæsarea, where at that time his long friendship with Basil probably commenced, he afterwards visited Palestine; and next studied for a short time in the catechetical school of Alexandria, of which Didymus was head, at the time when Athanasius was Archbishop. Leaving Alexandria to complete his education at Athens, he was much impressed by a violent storm at sea, and determined, if his life was spared, to receive Baptism[1]; though at what time he was baptized is unknown. At Athens he resided about ten years, leaving it in 357. Wishing to become acquainted with New Rome he visited Constantinople, and afterwards divided his time between his parents at Nazianzus and his friend Basil at Pontus. His father having, in 360, fallen unintentionally into the error of subscribing the Creed of Nikè-Rimini, Gregory induced him to make a public recantation and to publish an orthodox creed.

Gregory himself tells us that before his birth he was

[1] Athan. Orat. 18.

dedicated to God. This perhaps accounts for his father conferring on him Holy Orders on Christmas Day, 361, in spite of his reluctance[m]; he describes it as an act of tyranny, and for a time escaped to Pontus; but reflecting on his filial duty he, at Easter, 362, returned to Arianzus, where he acted as assistant to his aged and infirm father.

Gregory had a younger brother named Cæsarius, who held an important office at court, first under Julian and then under Valens; he dying at the age of 45, in 368, the year in which Nicæa, where he was at the time residing, was convulsed by an earthquake, was buried at Nazianzus, and was afterwards canonized, Gregory at his death devoting to him a Panegyric[n].

Gregory of Nyssa was a student rather than a man of business; but if his life was one of less practical usefulness than the lives of Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, he was at least their equal in theological attainments, and like them bore a prominent part in the defence of the Nicene faith. He was wrongfully accused by Demosthenes, the Arian Vicar of Pontus, and an enemy of Basil, of having been uncanonically consecrated and of embezzlement; and having been sentenced to deposition at a synod in his episcopal city in 376, he was banished by order of the Emperor, and an Arian appointed in his place.

Valens divided Cappadocia into two provinces, Cæsarea remaining the metropolis of one, Tyana, of which Anthimus was bishop, becoming the metropolis of the other. Anthimus thereupon claimed (and it would appear rightly) metropolitan rights over several of Basil's former

[m] Orat. 2. [n] Ibid. 7.

Suffragans. In the Roman Empire the ecclesiastical followed the civil arrangement. When Constantine the Great reunited in his person the provinces which Diocletian had parcelled out between several Augusti and Cæsares, he divided the whole Empire into four Pretorian Prefectures. With these Prefectures were made to correspond (but at what time is uncertain) the four Patriarchates of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. The successors of St. James at Jerusalem did not possess metropolitan authority, that having been given by the civil government to Cæsarea. The Prefectures were divided into Dioceses (a word of civil origin), the ecclesiastical heads of which were Archbishops (*ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως*). The Dioceses were sub-divided into Provinces, under a civil magistrate living in the principal city (*μητρόπολις*), whence the prelates presiding over Provinces were called Metropolitans (*ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας*).

The Canon of Chalcedon only gave its imprimatur to an already existing custom when it enacted; *εἰ τις ἐκ βασιλίδος ἐκαινίσθη πόλις τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικίων ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω*; and we learn from the Novels of Justinian that the Emperor claimed the right to decide whether the ecclesiastical head should have the title of Metropolitan, or the higher one of Archbishop[o], "volumus ut non solum Metropolitanus sed Archiepiscopus fiat."

Basil strenuously resisted the claim of Anthimus, and in order to strengthen his cause he created several new sees. One of these was Nyssa, an insignificant town

[o] This does not apply to the rank afterwards borne by Metropolitans in the Greco-Russian Church.

on the Halys, to which he appointed his brother Gregory; another was Sasima, a dirty little town without any marks of civilization. This see Basil, who, holy as he undoubtedly was, is represented as a man of iron will, with a dislike to being thwarted, forced on Gregory Nazianzen, a man of evidently weaker will; who reluctantly, at his father's request, accepted the appointment, for which his sensitive and intellectual mind was wholly unfitted. And unfortunately it caused a rupture between the two great Fathers of the Eastern Church. Gregory wrote to Basil[p]; "Give me above all things quiet;" and he spoke contemptuously of having "to fight, as though for souls, for sucking-pigs and fowls" (an allusion to the payment of tythe in kind); and that not for his own but Basil's use.

Sasima was one of the towns over which Anthimus claimed jurisdiction, and he now appointed a rival bishop. Gregory finding "the martial Anthimus an undesirable neighbour[q]," went back without even entering on the charge, and returning to Nazianzus acted as his father's coadjutor till the death of the latter in 374. There we will for the present leave him.

In August, 378, Valens was defeated and slain by the Goths in the battle of Hadrianople. The battle gave the death-blow to Arianism. By the death of Valens the Arian supremacy came to an end, and the victory of the Nicene faith was consummated; thenceforward the name of Semi-Arian is generally confined to the Macedonians or Pneumatomachi.

[p] Ep. 48. [q] Ibid.

CHAPTER III.

The Nicene Creed Re-affirmed.

The Roman Empire was now divided between the two sons of Valentinian I.: Gratian, a youth eighteen years of age, under the guidance of Ambrose, Archbishop of Milan, "the pillar of the Church," as St. Jerome styles him [a]; and his half-brother Valentinian II., a child four years of age, who was brought up under the influence of his mother Justina, whom the intolerance of her husband had embittered against the Orthodox Church.

The insecure state of the Empire from the Goths led Gratian, in July, 379, to confer the government of the East on an experienced General named Theodosius (afterwards entitled the Great), whilst the West was nominally shared between him and his child-brother Valentinian II. "The seeds of virtue," says Theodoret [b], "planted in her husband's heart were watered" by his first wife Placilla; and in the first year of his reign he was baptized by Acholius, Archbishop of Thessalonica. Gratian refused the title of Pontifex Maximus (the anomalous condition of a Christian Emperor giving his sanction to the Pagan custom of offering prayers to false gods for him); thus severing himself officially from the established Paganism of the Roman Empire; Theodosius, immediately after his Baptism, issued an edict that the faith, as held by the saintly Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria (of whose death he had not heard), should be the standard of Orthodoxy.

[a] Adv. Ruf. I. 2. [b] H.E. V. 18.

Gratian at once recalled the exiled bishops. Meletius returned to Antioch; Lucius was expelled, and Peter restored, to spend the few remaining days of his life at Alexandria; Gregory returned to Nyssa, to hear of the death of his brother Basil.

Basil's life had been a troubled one. Sozomen[c] gives an account of the persecution of his beloved Cæsarea by the Emperor Julian, who regarded it with extreme aversion, erasing it from the catalogue of nations, and depriving it of its name. When St. Gregory Nazianzen speaks of Julian being "justly incensed" against the Cæsareans, he is probably referring to the riots which attended the election of Eusebius, Basil's predecessor in the see. On the death of Dianius the people compelled by military force the provincial bishops to consecrate in his place Eusebius, a man of high character and known orthodoxy, but as yet a layman. The loss of so valuable a civil servant incensed Julian; and his anger was further increased when the bishops afterwards, protesting against their compulsion, tried to annul their act, a course from which they were dissuaded by the father of Gregory Nazianzen.

The Cæsareans further provoked Julian through their zeal for Orthodoxy, by recently destroying the Temple of Fortune (*τὸ Τυχεῖον*); in consequence of which Julian threatened to raze their city to the ground[d], a threat which he was prevented by death from carrying out; and Basil speaks[e] of two martyrs of Cæsarea, Eupsychius and Damas. This occurred before Basil was consecrated bishop.

Basil's episcopate began in trouble. His dear friend

[c] V. 5. [d] Bas. Ep. 40. [e] Ep. 252.

Eusebius, Bishop of Samosata (360—373), "that unflagging labourer in Apostolic work[f]," on his arrival at Cæsarea to take part in his consecration, found the city split up into two factions, Basil's election having been violently opposed, and carried by a single vote, that of the aged father of Gregory Nazianzen, who had been carried from his bed on a litter to record it.

And as it began, so did his episcopate continue. Most of the Orthodox bishops and all the good people of Cæsarea revered him; but he had enemies in the bishops who had been so narrowly outvoted, some of whom were his theological opponents. People of wealth and position opposed him, because his teaching of unworldliness and self-denial condemned their love of pleasure; people of the baser sort because he was the enemy of their vices. He was accused at times of being a Sabellian, an Arian, a Macedonian. He was blamed for altering the doxology; he explained that he only followed the advice of Ephrem Syrus, when the latter was on a visit to Cæsarea, in order to explain more fully the doctrine of the Trinity.

Valens in his crusade against Orthodoxy had met with almost uninterrupted success. But he found a staunch opponent in Basil. Soon after Basil became Archbishop, Valens offered him through the Prefect Modestus the alternative of Communion with the Arians, or deposition; and threatened him with confiscation, torture, exile, death. Basil told him he had only a ragged cloak and a few books; as to banishment, wherever God is, there is His pilgrim's home; as to torture and death, his body was so frail that the first stroke would do the work, and death would be a kindness, for it would bring him nearer God.

[f] Theod. H.E. IV. 12.

He died on January 1, 379, a prematurely old man, in his fiftieth year. Two years before his death he wrote to Peter of Alexandria[g]; "I seem to be deprived by my sins of all success in my undertakings." *Felix opportunitate mortis;* he lived long enough to hear of the Battle of Hadrianople, and the victory of that to which he had devoted his life, the cause of Orthodoxy.

In the year of Basil's death Gregory Nazianzen, at the request of the small remnant of Orthodox in the city, undertook a mission to Constantinople, which for forty years had been presided over by Arian bishops. There he was the "instructor in the Scriptures" of St. Jerome[h], who at that time translated *The Chronicle of Eusebius*, the Preface of which shows that he was sensible of the imperfections of the various versions of the old Testament and of the necessity of returning to the old Hebrew.

At Constantinople St. Gregory Nazianzen preached those five *Theological Orations* which gained for him the title of the *Theologian.* He began his mission in a room belonging to a relative, his Anastasia (*resurrection of the Nicene faith*), as he called it; people of all classes and ranks (and amongst them many Arians) flocked to hear him, till the room grew into a magnificent church, a permanent Anastasia.

At Constantinople he acted practically as bishop amongst the Orthodox. But he was in earnest, and having to deal with a community that had grown accustomed to the laxity of the Arian bishops he stirred up many enemies. He met with a violent opponent in one Maximus, a Cynic philosopher from Alexandria, who, by representing himself as a former Confessor,

[g] Ep. 266. [h] Hieron. Vir. II. 117.

imposed upon St. Athanasius (if at least this is the Maximus to whom Athanasius wrote)[i]; and on his successor Peter. When Peter found out that he was an impostor, Maximus took up his residence at Constantinople. Peter was succeeded by his brother Timothy (380—385), whom Maximus imposed upon in the same manner; and, by persuading him that the translation of Gregory from Sasima was uncanonical, was nominated by him Patriarch; Timothy thinking thus to exalt his own over the rival Patriarchate of Constantinople. When, however, Maximus was on the point of being consecrated at night by five bishops sent from Alexandria for the purpose, the mob broke in and drove them from the church; and Maximus, expelled from Constantinople, went to Thessalonica to lay his case before Theodosius.

On November 24, 380, Theodosius entered Constantinople with the view of inquiring into the matter, and enforcing the Nicene faith. The Arian bishop, Demophilus, refusing to accept the Nicene Creed, was deposed by the Emperor, and together with Lucius, who had gone there after his failure at Alexandria, compelled to leave Constantinople.

Since the Council of Nicæa the question had arisen whether the Holy Ghost is a distinct Person, or merely an influence and energy of the Father and the Son. Macedonius, the deposed bishop of Constantinople, had lately brought the subject into prominence; he "openly affirmed that the Holy Ghost is lower than the Father and the Son, a creature[k];" he "designated Him a minister and a servant, and applied to Him what could without error be said of the holy Angels[l]."

[i] Fest. Lett. 61. [k] Theod. II. 5. [l] Soz. IV. 7.

On May 2, 381, the Council, which was afterwards acknowledged as the second Œcumenical Council, met by order of Theodosius at Constantinople, to confirm the Nicene faith, and to reconcile the Macedonians to the Church[m]. It was composed of 150 bishops (hence called the Council of the 150 Fathers), all from the East, (such as Theodosius was in a position to call from his division of the Empire), prominent amongst them being :—Gregory Nazianzen; Meletius of Antioch; Timothy of Alexandria, who arrived later; Cyril of Jerusalem, who, Socrates states[n], only then renounced the Macedonian (*Semi-Arian*) heresy; his nephew Gelasius; Gregory of Nyssa; his brother Peter of Sebaste; Helladius, Basil's successor in the see of Cæsarea; Acholius of Thessalonica; Diodore of Tarsus; and Jacob of Nisibis; St. Jerome, the pupil of Gregory Nazianzen, was probably also present.

Thirty-six Macedonian bishops, invited by Theodosius, arrived under Eleusius of Cyzicus and Marcian of Lampsacus; but, refusing to be reconciled to the Church, soon left the Council; they declared that they preferred the Arian dogma, and would not admit that the Son was of the same essence as the Father[o]; and they wrote to their friends everywhere to dissuade them from agreeing with the Nicene doctrine.

Timothy of Alexandria not having arrived, Meletius of Antioch (although disowned at Rome) was appointed President, the inaugural address being delivered by Gregory of Nyssa. Maximus was declared to be no

[m] Soc. V. 8. The Macedonians were also called Marathonians after Marathonius, bishop of Nicomedia, who had once held a military appointment and was an influential member of the party.

[n] VIII. 7. [o] Soc. V. 8.

bishop; and Gregory Nazianzen, at the request of the Emperor and the majority of the bishops, reluctantly accepted the bishopric of Constantinople. Meletius dying a few days afterwards, Gregory of Nyssa preaching the sermon on the occasion, Gregory Nazianzen was appointed President. It may be observed in passing that, although Meletius died out of Communion with Rome, he is a canonized Saint of the Catholic Church.

An unfortunate circumstance followed the death of Meletius. A proposal had been made, "gently and mildly," says Theodoret [p], by "the divine Meletius," but not agreed to by Paulinus, that on the death of either the survivor should be recognized as Archbishop of Antioch. Gregory Nazianzen now proposed that Paulinus should be so recognized by both parties; but the bishops generally, considering that this would be a concession to Pope Damasus and the Western Church, continued the schism by carrying the election of Flavian (381—404), an orthodox and highly respected presbyter of Antioch.

Timothy and the Egyptian bishops now arriving resented the commencement of the Council in their absence, the deposition of Maximus, and the appointment of Gregory as President. The Asiatics also were offended with Gregory's opposition to the election of Flavian. Little adapted to cope with turbulence and discord, Gregory resigned the presidency, and received the reluctant consent of the Emperor to his resigning the bishopric also, which he had involuntarily accepted and only held seven months; and Nectarius (381—397), Prefect of the city and a native of Tarsus, a man "mild and gentle

[p] H.E. V. 3.

in his manners and admirable in his whole course of life[q]," but only a catechumen, was, probably through the influence of Diodore, appointed to succeed him[r].

Gregory, bidding farewell to his Anastasia, his "modern Shiloh[s]," left Constantinople in June and returned to Nazianzus, where, finding that there was no bishop and that Apollinarianism was rife, he undertook the episcopal charge until Eulalius was appointed in 383, when he retired to Arianzus, in the neighbourhood of which he spent in seclusion the remaining years of his life, dying in 389.

The Council of Constantinople re-affirmed the Nicene Creed. The late Canon Bright says, "it made certain alterations in the Creed, to meet the errors of the time." The explanatory clauses have been by some attributed to St. Gregory of Nyssa, by others to St. Gregory Nazianzen. But the Creed which we call Nicene or Constantinopolitan corresponds, almost word for word, with a Confession of Faith found in a treatise entitled *Ancoratus*[t], by Epiphanius, bishop of Constantia (*Salamis*; 367—403), written about A.D. 374 (seven years, therefore, before the Council of Constantinople), as the baptismal form of the Creed used in his time; which Creed also corresponds with the baptismal form of the Creed used by St. Cyril in the Church of Jerusalem[u]. The Creed is supposed by some to have been presented to the Council through the interest (although he was not himself present) of St. Epiphanius; by others to have been read

[q] Soc. V. 8.

[r] A precedent had lately been set in the Western Church in the case of St. Ambrose, who, in his own language ("Duties of the Clergy") had "to teach what he had not yet learnt."

[s] Orat. XLII. 6.

[t] Epiph. H.E. 120.

[u] See "Conclusion" of this work.

by St. Cyril in proof of his orthodoxy, which was called in question. It was pronounced orthodox, and Cyril was acquitted. But on the other hand, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, whilst they speak of the adherence of the Council to the faith of Nicæa, know of no new Creed; it was not read at the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus; the late Professor Swainson doubts its having been read at all at Constantinople; if it was, he says, "it was read and then placed in the archives of Constantinople." All that can be said for certain is that the Constantinopolitan form was read with the Nicene Creed at Chalcedon, and was eventually received by the whole Catholic Church.

The Council passed four canons[x]. Canon I. enacted that the Creed of the 318 Fathers assembled at Nicæa should not be abolished (*μὴ ἀθητεῖσθαι*). Every heresy was to be anathematized, especially that of the Eunomians or Anomœans, Arians or Eudoxians, Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarians. These last were the followers of Apollinaris, appointed bishop of Laodicea in 362. As Arius assailed the Divinity, so Apollinaris assailed the Humanity of Christ; whilst he held the Divinity he denied the completeness of the Human Nature, and asserted that Christ had a human body and a human soul (*anima animans*), but not a reasonable soul (*anima rationalis*), the latter being supplied by the divine Logos. Amongst the Apollinarians Theodoret[y] reckons Maximus the Cynic.

Canon II. (probably with reference to the action of Timothy in the case of Maximus) enacted:—"Let not bishops go out of their Dioceses to foreign churches. But

[x] Canons V., VI., and VII. sometimes assigned to it are generally allowed to be later additions, or to belong to the council of 382.

[y] H.E. V. 8.

in accordance with the canons, the Bishop of Alexandria shall govern the affairs of Egypt only; and the bishops of the East the affairs of the East only, the right (*πρεσβεῖον*) of the Bishop of Antioch, mentioned in the canons of Nicæa, being preserved. The Bishop of the Asian Diocese" (Ephesus) "shall have jurisdiction over Asia only;" those of the Dioceses of Pontus ("Cæsarea") over Pontus, those of Thrace ("Heraclea") over Thrace.—"The Churches amongst the barbarous nations" (i.e. not subject to the Empire) "must be governed according to the custom which prevailed from their fathers."

Canon III. is of importance as giving Œcumenical sanction to the rank conferred by Imperial authority on the principal sees, the ecclesiastical, as has been before stated, following the civil arrangement. The Bishop of Byzantium or Constantinople had hitherto been an ordinary bishop, subject to the Metropolitan of Heraclea. Since the Council of Nicæa Constantine the Great had made Constantinople the Imperial city, and the transference of the capital from "Old Rome" to "New Rome" necessitated the third Canon:—"The Bishop of Constantinople shall hold the first rank (*τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς*) after (*μετά*) the Bishop of Rome, because it is New Rome[z]."

The Council recognized Jerusalem as the Mother of all Churches (*τῆς μητρὸς ἁπάσων τῶν Ἐκκλησίων*); and Antioch as the oldest see in Christendom (*πρεσβυτάτη καὶ ὄντως ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία*[a]); for it was believed that St. Peter had been Bishop of Antioch (*Θρόνον τῆς Ἀντιόχεως μητροπόλεως τὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου*)[b].

At the time with which we are now concerned Alex-

[z] Socrates (V. 8) and Sozomen (VII. 9) expressly state that the Council published this decree.

[a] Syn. Lett. [b] Syn. Chal. Act. VII.

andria was probably the most important see in the world; we have seen above how Timothy even thought fit to appoint the Bishop of Constantinople. "I must observe," says Bingham, that the Primate of Alexandria was the greatest Metropolitan in the world, both for the absoluteness of his power and the extent of his jurisdiction. For he was not Metropolitan of a single Province, but of all the Provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in which there were at least six large Provinces, out of which sometimes 100 bishops were called to a Provincial Council." At the council of Alexandria in 339, he continues, 100 bishops sat, "which was 30 more than the Roman Libra[c]; " and the Primate had prerogatives which no other Primate had, one of which was the right of consecrating the Suffragans throughout all the Provinces of his Diocese.

By Canon III. of Constantinople, Alexandria, which had hitherto been the head of the Eastern, as Rome was the head of the Western, Church, and Antioch fell a scale. Timothy was evidently outvoted, and so irritated was he that he left Constantinople and returned to Alexandria. It was an old maxim "ubi Imperator ibi Roma;" an honorary precedence had always been given to Old Rome on the ground that it was the Imperial city; a similar precedence, and on the same ground, was now given to New Rome, whose bishop became and has ever since continued to be the head of the Orthodox Greek Church.

Canon IV. was directed against Maximus the Cynic. It declared that he was not then, and never had been,

[c] Ant. II. 16, 23. The word Libra designates the number of Roman bishops, which was seventy.

a bishop, nor were those ordained by him rightly ordained.

By Canon VII. (which some attribute to this Council) it was enacted that the Sacrament of Unction with Chrism, or Confirmation, should be administered to baptized converts; they were to be sealed (*σφραγιζομένους*), or anointed (*χριομένους*), with the holy oil, on the forehead, eyes, nostrils, mouth, and ears, with the words, "the Seal of the Gift of the Holy Ghost;" (*Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου*). But converts from the Eunomians, who only used single immersion, were to be re-baptized.

The Creed of the Council was accepted at Rome, but not so the canons. Baronius says that the Pope summoned the Council; if so he must have learnt what the Council enacted. But Pope Leo. I., who lived sixty years afterwards, asserted [d] that the Canons had never been sent to Rome. The Popes long continued to speak of three Œcumenical Councils, of Nicæa, of Ephesus and Chalcedon, and to ignore the dignity conferred on Constantinople by the second Œcumenical Council. But all doubt is set at rest by one of the greatest of the Popes, Gregory I., who ranked it amongst the four councils, which he said he reverenced as the four Gospels [e]. When Constantinople was conquered by the Latins in 1204, and a Latin Patriarch appointed, Pope Innocent III. recognized the Patriarchal rank of Constantinople. It was also recognized in the Lateran Council of 1215, and at the so-called Union of Florence.

The Council of Constantinople was passed over in silence at the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, and at the Latrocinium; but it was recognized at Chalcedon, and

[d] Leo, Ep. CVI. 5; CVII.

[e] Ep. Lib. I. 25.

has since been acknowledged as Œcumenical by the Eastern and Western Churches.

Theodosius acceded to a request made in the Synodal Letter, and confirmed the decision of the Council; and commanded by a decree, that all the churches should be surrendered to the Orthodox.

The Arians, imagining that they could rely upon strong support from the East, requested Gratian to summon another General Council in the West, but so far from gratifying them, Gratian, by the advice of Ambrose, convened, in September, 381, the Provincial Council of Aquileia, with the result that three Arian bishops were deposed.

In the early summer of 382 another council, composed of nearly the same bishops as the Œcumenical Council, met by order of Theodosius at Constantinople. Gregory Nazianzen, though twice invited, declined to attend;—"I have never," he said, "been at a synod which did more for the suppression, than it did for the increase, of evils[f]." The council received a letter from the Western bishops inviting them to attend a council which was sitting at Rome; in reply they sent a Synodal Letter, excusing themselves on the ground that they had left their dioceses uncommissioned and unequipped for a longer journey than to Constantinople; they expressed their disposition for unity, their zeal for the Nicene Creed and the Orthodox Church.

In a third council at Constantinople in 383, which Gregory of Nyssa attended, Theodosius, at the instance of Nectarius, demanded from the Orthodox and the various sects present written statements of their faith;

[f] Ep. 131.

having examined them carefully he rejected and tore up all except that of the Orthodox Church; but he was so pleased with the profession of the Novatians that he promulgated a decree, granting them the same privileges as were possessed by the Orthodox. The Arian bishops, whilst disagreeing amongst themselves, wrote to their adherents that many had gone over to the Homo-ousians; "for many are called but few chosen[g]." The Emperor now forbade all sectaries, except the Novatians, to hold services and to ordain, and threatened them with civil punishment; not, says Sozomen[h], with the intention of carrying out his threat, but to frighten them into unity.

Amongst the benefactors of the Church, says Gibbon, the fame of Constantine was rivalled by Theodosius; "if Constantine erected the banner of the Cross, Theodosius subdued the Arian heresy and abolished Paganism." It has been said that Christianity gave birth to religious toleration. But the fall of Paganism forms a less glorious chapter in the history of the Christian Church than its hard-fought battle with, and its victory over, Arianism. In the latter case Orthodoxy, in the former Paganism, was persecuted. In the victory over Paganism there was no Athanasius, no Hilary, no Basil, no Gregory of Nazianzus, or of Nyssa; Pagans, like the Orthodox Christians before them, were persecuted by the civil government, influenced by three leading bishops, Ambrose, Acholius, and Nectarius.

The principle of toleration generally actuated the Pagan Emperors; and if some, even of the best of the number, departed from it, it was from a mistaken notion that the Christians, who were at the time praying for

[g] Soc. V. 10. [h] VII. 12.

them in the catacombs, were bad citizens, and were a faction dangerous to the civil government. But Gratian and Theodosius could plead no such excuse. Constantine the Great, whilst he secured his New Rome against Pagan abominations, only interfered with the legal ceremonial lingering on in Old Rome, so far as it was morally corrupt; Gratian took a step in the right direction when he refused the title of Pontifex Maximus. But he went further, and confiscated the property of the Vestal Virgins; whilst Theodosius not only prohibited Pagan sacrifices, but was guilty of gross vandalism, in destroying temples, statues, and other precious works of art[i]; the most notorious acts being carried out under the superintendence of Theophilus, the discreditable Archbishop of Alexandria[k]. "All the world over," says Theodoret[l], "the shrines of the idols were destroyed;" and the example set by Theodosius, Alaric and his Goths were not slow to follow.

Under Gratian and Theodosius Paganism ceased to be the established religion of the Roman Empire; but it was not abolished, nor was Christianity required as the necessary condition for holding civil or military offices, and at the very time that Theodosius was coercing Pagans, he bestowed special marks of favour on the Pagan rhetorician Libanius. But by the prohibition of its public worship and ceremonial, and the rigorous enforcement of the laws, Paganism received its death-blow, and its disappearance was only a matter of time.

In 383 Gratian was assassinated at Lyons in a revolt of the troops under Maximus, who then became virtually

[i] Soz. VII. 13; Theod. H.E. V. 21.

[k] Soc. V. 16 and 17.

[l] H.E. V. 22.

Emperor of the West (383—388), Valentinian II. being a mere boy.

In 385 Timothy of Alexandria died and was succeeded by Theophilus (385—412), to whom we have alluded above; under whom and his successor Cyril the see of Alexandria reached its greatest height; and "the power of its prelates," says Dr. Neale, "was in some respects greater than that of the Bishop of Rome over his own prelates."

In 388, Maximus being defeated by Theodosius, was put to death. In the same year Paulinus of Antioch died, having on his death-bed consecrated Evagrius as his successor; thus continuing the schism; but on the death of Evagrius (perhaps in 392), Flavian was the sole occupant of the see until his death in 404.

In 388 likewise died Justina; the young Valentinian then threw off his Arian associations, and placed himself under the direction of St. Ambrose.

In May, 392, Valentinian II. was, at the age of 19, murdered by Argobastes, Master of the Horse to Eugenius; having from a mistaken notion, prevalent at the time, deferred his Baptism and dying unbaptized. St. Ambrose, himself overwhelmed with grief, comforted his sorrowing sisters with the assurance that a sincere desire for Baptism, if accidentally frustrated, insured its benefits, an opinion which Gregory of Nyssa did not share; of one who wilfully deferred Baptism he wrote; "Thou art out of Paradise, O catechumen[m]!"

The puppet Emperor Eugenius who was now set up thought it a politic measure to profess Paganism[n]; but

[m] Treatise "Against those who defer Baptism."
[n] Ambrose, Ep. 57.

in September, 394, he was defeated in battle, and put to death by order of Theodosius; who then reigned as sole Emperor.

In 395 the great Emperor died at Milan in the arms of Ambrose, his second wife Galla, the sister of Gratian, having predeceased him, leaving a daughter, Galla Placidia, who became the mother of the Western Emperor, Valentinian III.

Gratian though twice married left no children. On the death of Theodosius the Roman Empire was divided between his two imbecile sons: Arcadius, a youth eighteen years of age, who reigned in the East (395—408); and Honorius, a boy of eleven, in the West (395—423). The division of the Empire at the very time when a community of feeling and action was especially needed was most disastrous. What were really two distinct nations came into existence, both calling themselves Roman, but having no cohesion, and thoroughly out of harmony with each other.

The great event in the world's history which the Germans call Volkerwanderung (*Wandering of the Nations*), was at hand; one German tribe pushing on another to settle down and found new nations in the West, although they never could effect a permanent settlement in the East. Barbarian as they were, they had in them the seeds of civilization which the Roman Empire needed, and brought with them the new blood which was required to build up the future Christendom.

Although from its foundation till A.D. 476, New Rome continued to be the chief, and after 476 the sole, capital of the Roman Empire, yet Old Rome always had over men's minds a preponderating influence, which extended to its Bishop. The new nations destroyed Pagan Rome,

but Christian Rome arose on its ruins. Most of them were already Christians, although under the imperfect form of Arianism, taught them by their "Apostle" Ulphilas; and whilst they destroyed Pagan palaces and temples, a feeling of reverence led them to respect and spare Christian churches. In time they adopted the Catholic Faith; and thenceforward the Pope became the greatest and most influential person in Rome. Some wise Providence prevented them conferring on the East the benefits which they conferred on the West. Old Rome had hitherto produced no great bishop; no Athanasius; no Basil; no Gregory of Nazianzus or of Nyssa; but we shall henceforth find the Popes taking a leading part in the counsels of Christendom.

In April, 397, St. Ambrose, and in September of the same year Nectarius, died; and on February 26, 398, John, surnamed from his eloquence Chrysostom (*Χρύσος στόμα*), "the great luminary of the world[o]," was consecrated Patriarch of Constantinople.

Born at Antioch (perhaps A.D. 347), after studying rhetoric in the school of Libanius, where one of his fellow-students was Theodore, afterwards (392—428) the famous Bishop of Mopsuestia (whom he dissuaded from entering on the married state)[p], Chrysostom for some time practised as a rhetorician, "surpassing," Libanius said of him, "all the orators of the age[q]." After his Baptism, by Meletius, in 370, he lived an ascetic life, first in his own home, and after his saintly mother Anthusa's death, in a monastery near Antioch (374—381), presided over by the famous Diodore, afterwards Bishop of Tarsus (379—394). In 381, the year of the great Council of

[o] Theod. H.E. V. 27. [p] Soz. VIII. 21. [q] Ibid.

Constantinople, he was ordained deacon by Meletius (that being one of the last ordinations he could have conferred); and, five years later, priest by Flavian, exercising his ministry at Antioch (386—397); preaching to crowded congregations of eager listeners; from 398—404 he was Patriarch of Constantinople.

In order to understand the cruel persecutions which Chrysostom had to endure we must know the state of the Church in his time. The Church had triumphed over persecution, over Arianism, and, by State aid, over Paganism; but it had not grown in Godliness since the earliest days of Christianity. Pliny, writing about A.D. 100 to the Emperor Trajan, said that Christianity had then so progressed as nearly to empty the Pagan temples in Bithynia. The age of the persecutions followed, and the Church prospered in adversity. But the smiles of the Emperors were more fatal to it than the sword of the executioner; spacious churches indeed and a grand ceremonial met the eye, but religious Pagans like Libanius remarked that Christianity had degenerated; that it was more material and corrupt than their own Neo-Platonism; that it had lost what was good and assimilated what was bad in Paganism.

At Antioch Chrysostom preached, first as deacon and afterwards as priest, to a dissolute population of 100,000 souls. The great preacher complained that their evil living was in strong contrast to the lives of the early Christians, and his chief difficulty in working amongst Pagans; that he even feared, as Libanius cherished the hope, that Paganism would re-conquer the Church.

Alexandria was presided over by a Patriarch notorious for his vices. Gregory of Nyssa complained of the scenes of debauchery which attended the pilgrimages to Jeru-

salem, and that the Holy City was defiled by adultery, theft, and murder[r]. The state of things was no better at Constantinople, where the clergy, under the lax rule of the amiable but incapable Nectarius, had grown worldly-minded and dissolute, and were accused of various crimes, not excepting adultery, murder, and living with *spiritual sisters* (*συνείσακτοι*).

The same was the case throughout Thrace and Asia Minor. Ephesus was a see second only to the great Patriarchates. Antoninus, Metropolitan of Ephesus, was accused of simony and other flagrant crimes, by Eusebius, bishop of Lydia; and Chrysostom himself was called upon to investigate the matter in two synods, one at Constantinople in 400, the other in the following year at Ephesus. Eusebius was proved to be a pious hypocrite and was excommunicated. The charges against Antoninus were gone into at the first council, but were not proved. Soon afterwards he died; Chrysostom then held the second council, which was attended by seventy bishops; six bishops confessing that they had purchased their sees from Antoninus were deprived; whilst his heirs were sentenced to refund the proceeds of his simony. This council appointed Chrysostom's deacon, Heraclides, Archbishop of Ephesus[s].

Nor does a better state of things meet us as we proceed Westward to Rome and Milan; in 384 Jerome left the former city with a curse on his lips for its Babylonish wickedness, and shaking off the dust from his feet.

Chrysostom was inveigled from Antioch to Constantinople by the wiles of Asterius, *Comes Orientis*, acting under orders from the Prime Minister, Eutropius. Well

[r] Cyril, On Pilgrimages. [s] Soc. VI. 11; Soz. VIII. 6.

knowing that Chrysostom would refuse the office of bishop, and that the people of Antioch would not consent to part with him; Asterius "fearing a sedition[t]," conveyed him a strict prisoner to Constantinople, a distance of 800 miles, where Chrysostom learnt for the first time that the Emperor had appointed him to the Patriarchate. He was told that the Emperor's wishes must be obeyed, and he was forced to accept the unwelcome office; he had an enemy in Theophilus of Alexandria. Theophilus began well, but, as Cardinal Newman says in his Historical Sketches, "the faults of a domineering nature, aggravated by the lordly position of his see," came to the surface. He had a candidate of his own, a Nitrian monk named Isidore, at that time his staunch ally, but who afterwards became his bitter foe[u], whom he thought to use as a tool in advancing the see of Alexandria over that of Constantinople; and only under the threat of Eutropius to expose his many misdemeanours did Theophilus consent to consecrate Chrysostom.

Over the better classes at Constantinople the ascetic discipline taught and practised by Chrysostom soon gained him greater influence even than he had possessed at Antioch. He at once applied himself to a general reformation. A Patriarch who was in earnest and bent on reform was little to the mind of Theophilus, who sided with the careless and pleasure-seeking classes of the people; whilst the malcontent clergy contrasted the austerities of Chrysostom with the laxity of his predecessor. Of sin and vicious pleasures he was the uncompromising enemy; but his compassion for the returning penitent, the gentleness with which he spoke of heretics,

[t] Soz. VIII. 2.

[u] Soc. VI. 9.

excited the anger of the ill-disposed but rigidly orthodox bishops, many of whom had, with indecent importunity, intrigued for the office which he so reluctantly accepted. Many of the neighbouring bishops complained also that on their visits to Constantinople they did not find him given to hospitality, as St. Paul says a bishop ought to be.

For such a task as lay before him discretion was necessary, and here seems to have been his weak point. He is described as being stern and severe, with a proneness to haughtiness and irritability [x]; and the ill-feeling which he excited amongst the clergy was increased by his deacon Serapion, a man, says Sozomen [y], "always ready to insult his opponents," who exclaimed in a full assembly: "You will never be able to govern these men, my Lord, without a rod."

Religious people continued to love and revere him, and the enmity of the baser sort was powerless so long as he had the Court and the leading families on his side. The religious but indolent Emperor was naturally inclined to admire the holiness of Chrysostom's character; but a change had taken place at the Court. In 399 Eutropius, who had latterly been amongst Chrysostom's opponents, having forfeited the favour of Arcadius, was beheaded, and the weak Emperor was thenceforward wholly under the influence of the Empress Eudoxia. Eudoxia at first welcomed Chrysostom and was inclined to patronise him, but only so long as he would let her have her own way; religious so far as suited her, she was thoroughly worldly-minded, absorbed in luxury and pleasures, and those of a not very innocent character; she was also jealous of Chrysostom's influence over her

[x] Soc. VI. 3. [y] VIII. 9.

husband; and she soon headed the opposition against him.

He also had enemies in the ladies of the Court and the great ladies of the city, whose frivolity and artificial dressing he treated with scorn.

In 399 Chrysostom obtained an edict for the destruction of the remaining Pagan temples in Phœnicia[z]. He appointed orthodox Presbyters and Deacons to preach in their own language to the numerous Goths who were resident in Constantinople; and sent missionaries to the Gothic tribes on the Danube, whom Ulphilas had converted to Arianism. But his work of usefulness was impeded, and he fell a victim to the jealousy of Eudoxia and the shifty irreligion of Theophilus. Nor did the example of his father, Theodosius, who, to atone for the indiscriminate massacre of 7,000 people at Thessalonica, publicly did penance, at the bidding of Ambrose, in the cathedral of Milan, influence Arcadius in his dealings with Chrysostom.

A sharp controversy was going on about the works of Origen (c. 184—253), reputed the most learned theologian of the early Church. John II. (386—417), the successor of St. Cyril in the see of Jerusalem, and Rufinus the historian advocated Origenism; but St. Jerome, who was once a strong panegyrist of Origen, now took the opposite side; and a violent quarrel between him and Rufinus was the consequence of Rufinus' translation of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* (*On First Principles*) of Origen.

A still more violent opponent of Origenism was Epiphanius, the saintly but narrow-minded bishop of Constantia[a]. Hearing that Origenism had broken out in

[z] Theod. V. 29.

[a] See p. 97.

Palestine, he, in 394, hurried off to Jerusalem, where he made a bad return for John's proffered hospitality by preaching against him, inducing Jerome to separate from his own bishop, creating a schism amongst Jerome's monks at Bethlehem, and ordaining, by force, Jerome's younger brother, Paulinian, to minister amongst them [b].

Against the schismatical proceedings of Jerome John appealed to Theophilus, who was at the time an Origenist. Theophilus despatched an Alexandrian monk to Jerusalem to enquire into the matter, and so unfavourable to Jerome was his report, that Theophilus refused to take any notice of his letters, till 397, when he wrote counselling him to obey the canons of the Church [c].

Soon, however, Theophilus changed sides and joined the anti-Origenist party, and in a synod at Alexandria, in 399, he condemned Origenism, and expelled its followers from Alexandria. It mattered not to Theophilus that his great predecessor Athanasius spoke [d] of the "labour-loving" (*φιλόπονος*) Origen, of his agreement in the doctrine of the "everlasting co-existence of the Word with the Father, and that He is not of another essence or subsistence." It is true neither this nor other controversies on Origen turned on the Homo-ousion; but they did turn on various disjointed and isolated passages, from which any meaning can often be extorted.

Two Popes of Rome took different sides in the controversy; Siricius (384—398) took his part and befriended Rufinus; his successor Anastasius (398—402), in a council at Rome in 400, condemned Rufinus, and summoned him to Rome; Rufinus did not go, but he addressed an *Apology* to Anastasius; and the Pope, although he wrote to John

[b] Hieron. Ep. LI. [c] Ibid. Ep. LXIII. [d] De Dec. 27.

of Jerusalem that he neither knew who Origen was nor what he wrote, spoke of "the great pleasure given him by a recent decree of the two Emperors condemning the impious works" of Origen.

Four monks of Nitria, known as the Tall (μακροι) Brothers, who were strong supporters of Origenism, being amongst those expelled from Alexandria, went, accompanied by the above-mentioned Isidore, to Palestine in the hope of finding protection from John of Jerusalem. Being disappointed in their expectation they next went to Constantinople, hoping to enlist Chrysostom in their cause; Chrysostom ministered to their bodily wants, but "though he did not exclude them from the communion of Prayers," yet, as they were under the jurisdiction of Alexandria, refrained from admitting them to "Communion of the sacred mysteries [e]."

Epiphanius held in 402 a Council of Cypriot bishops, which condemned Origenism; and having failed to persuade Chrysostom to adopt the same course, he, "at the suggestion of Theophilus [f]," went to Constantinople, where he acted in the same uncanonical manner as at Jerusalem. In St. John's Church outside the city he celebrated a service, and ordained a deacon [g]; and when in Constantinople refused to stay in the episcopal palace, or to communicate with Chrysostom until he should expel the Tall Brothers. Eventually, being warned by Chrysostom that his schismatical acts were likely to excite a tumult, he left Constantinople, dying on board ship in 403, on his way back to Cyprus.

The Tall Brothers represented their case at court, and

[e] Soc. VI. 9. [f] Ibid. 12.

[g] Contrary to Apost. Can. XXV. and Can. XVI. of Nicæa.

brought such serious accusations against Theophilus that he was ordered to appear and defend his conduct at Constantinople. This was a bold step on the part of the Emperor, for the Patriarchs of Alexandria had risen to such a height, not only of ecclesiastical but also of civil power, as to be little short of Sovereign Princes; and in influence Theophilus was almost equal to the Emperor himself; Theophilus, however, went, and attended by his nephew Cyril, and a grand retinue of Egyptian and Abyssinian bishops, arrived in June, 403, at Constantinople, where he refused to hold intercourse with Chrysostom.

Meanwhile Chrysostom had increased the enmity against himself, especially on the part of Eudoxia. The wily Theophilus now seized the opportunity of increasing the prestige of his own Patriarchate, and lowering that of Constantinople. He assumed jurisdiction over Chrysostom, and instead of appearing as defendant in his own trial, passed over to Chalcedon, of which his own cousin Cyrinus, an Egyptian, and a violent opponent of Chrysostom, was bishop, and there he held the Council of the Oak (*ad quercum;* ἐπὶ δρῦν), the property of the Pretor Rufinus, who had built there a grand church and monastery [h]. The council was attended by thirty-six bishops, nearly all Egyptians (and therefore Theophilus' own Suffragans), and was presided over by Paul, Metropolitan of Heraclea, the bishops of which see always bore ill-will against the bishops of Constantinople, whose Metropolitans they had once been, but whose Suffragans they then were.

Chrysostom (like St. Athanasius with regard to the Council of Cæsarea) took exception to the council on

[h] Soz. VIII. 17.

the ground that the judges were his enemies; though four times summoned he refused to appear, sitting calmly in his lodging with forty of his own bishops. A number of frivolous and absurd charges were brought against him; such as calling Epiphanius a fool; bathing alone; eating alone, and immoderately as a Cyclops; eating a pastile (*little cake*) after Communion. This was the only true charge[i]. He was pronounced contumacious and guilty of high treason; and the weak Arcadius, ruled by his wife, sentenced him to banishment for life.

After three days Chrysostom, fearing an insurrection, quietly surrendered himself, and was put on board a vessel for banishment; scarcely had he crossed the Bosphorus than an earthquake at Constantinople so alarmed the Empress that she prevailed on Arcadius to recall him; and so strongly was the popular feeling in his favour that Theophilus, in fear of his life, sailed away to Alexandria, from which safe distance he continued his hostility.

In 403 a synod at Constantinople, consisting of sixty-five bishops, seven of whom were Metropolitans, annulled the proceedings of the Oak and re-instated Chrysostom. Theophilus little troubled himself that a synod of doubtful orthodoxy had been turned against the great Athanasius; he sent to Constantinople three bishops with the canon of Antioch[k], which ordered the deprivation of a bishop who, having been deposed by a council, should appeal to the civil power. Chrysostom had grievously offended the Empress through an incautious expression in a sermon; at the end of 403 his enemies held a fresh synod; no re-

[i] He advocated eating a pastile and drinking a little water to prevent any of the Sacrament escaping from the mouth. Hefele's Councils, II. 434 n.

[k] See p. 54.

gard was paid to the fact that a larger synod than the Oak had re-instated him; the other charges against him were dropped[l]; the canon of Antioch was put in force, and he was again sentenced to banishment.

It was the night of the Great Sabbath of 404, the only Saturday in the year which the Greek Church observes as a Fast; a night specially set apart for the Baptism of Catechumens. A miscreant band of soldiers broke into the church of St. Sophia, and interrupted the solemn service; the clergy were attacked at the font, and the baptismal water was stained by blood. The soldiers then rushed to the Holy Table, which was ready prepared for the Communion of those to be baptized on the following morning, and (to use Chrysostom's own words) "the most holy Blood was poured on the uniforms of the soldiers."

On June 5, Arcadius signed the edict for his banishment, and Arsacius (404—406), an old man of more than 80 years, who had been one of Chrysostom's accusers at the Oak, and was the brother of Nectarius, was appointed Patriarch. In November a law was passed enforcing Communion with him; with the profligate successor of Flavian at Antioch, Porphyry (404—413), (with whom the people refused to hold Communion); and Theophilus of Alexandria[m].

The place selected for Chrysostom's banishment was Cucusus, a miserable little town where he suffered from the intense heat of summer and cold of winter; the same place where his saintly predecessor Paul had been banished and strangled 50 years before. But in his exile he was able to exert even greater influence than before;

[l] Soc. VIII. 20.

[m] Soz. VIII. 24.

his name and innocence were revered throughout the whole of Christendom, and his friends supplied him with large sums of money which enabled him to set on foot missions to the Arian Goths, and to Persia, and Scythia.

Danger from Isaurian free-booters necessitated his removal thence in the winter of 405, to Arabissus, about 60 miles distant; there he suffered even worse torments than at Cucusus, so that he welcomed his return to the latter place in the Spring of 406.

In that year Atticus (406—426) succeeded Arsacius in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He too had been one of Chrysostom's accusers at the Oak, and still was his bitter enemy. Porphyry wrote to him that Chrysostom was directing missions to Persia and Phœnicia; that he was enlisting the sympathy of the Pope of Rome and the Western bishops against the Eastern Patriarchs; and that Arcadius must be induced to banish him to some more distant spot. Eudoxia had died in 404. The weak Arcadius, though no longer under her influence, was ready to lend his ear to the last speaker; the episcopal maligners persuaded him that Chrysostom was fomenting a conspiracy of the Western against the Eastern Church; he accepted the salve to his conscience which they offered, that the guilt of his action would be theirs and not the Emperor's, and acceded to the murderous project of banishing Chrysostom to Pityus on the Euxine Sea, the bleakest and most inhospitable climate in the whole Empire.

Chrysostom was now committed to the charge of two brutal guards who were commissioned to hurry him on without regard to his health or strength. Forced along for three months more dead than alive, through

scorching heat and drenching rain; all places avoided where he might find ordinary comfort, and the most squalid villages selected as halting places, he reached Comana (*Tokat*) in Pontus. There it was evident that Chrysostom's strength was gone and his end near; still they dragged him six miles further, resting the night in the church of St. Basiliscus, a bishop of Comana, who died a martyr in 312. The next morning (September 14, 407), he in vain implored a little longer rest, and was again hurried on. They had not proceeded far when his guards, perceiving unmistakable signs that he was dying, retraced their steps to the church; there being carried to the Holy Table he received the Eucharist, and clothed in white robes, and with the Doxology on his lips, he calmly expired, to find a temporary resting-place by the side of his fellow-martyr bishop.

St. Chrysostom was the last in date of the four great Fathers of the Greek Church, the others being SS. Athanasius, Basil the Great, and Gregory Nazianzen. The fate of Chrysostom, says Dean Farrar, produced age-long consequences both over the Eastern and Western Churches. Thenceforth, he continues, the Patriarchate of Constantinople produced no mighty Church-leader to confront civil tyranny; no great Saint or orator like Chrysostom swayed the diminished power of the great Eastern Metropolis. Whilst it weakened the Eastern it strengthened the Western Church. The dwindling power of the Western Empire till Romulus Augustulus increased the ever-deepening influence of the Popes; the distracted age looked for guidance, and found it only in the chief bishop of the West.

CHAPTER IV.

The Dyophysite and Monophysite Controversies.

The Emperor Arcadius was succeeded by his son Theodosius II. (408—450), a boy 8 years of age, who grew up a pious but feeble Prince, under the care and guidance of his able sister Pulcheria, who was, in 414, proclaimed Augusta, and for many years during the reign of Theodosius virtually governed the Eastern Empire.

Theophilus of Alexandria was succeeded by his brother's son, St. Cyril (412—444). Porphyry was succeeded at Antioch by Alexander (413—420), in whose pontificate the Antiochene schism, after having lasted more than 80 years, came to an end. He replaced St. Chrysostom's name on the Diptychs, and personally visiting Constantinople obtained from Atticus the same tardy act of justice, which was extorted by the threats of the populace. Alexander had a worthy successor in Theodotus (420—429), "the pearl of purity[a]." John of Jerusalem was succeeded by Praylius (416—420); after whom followed Juvenal (420—c. 458).

In 420, St. Jerome died at Bethlehem, where he completed his Vulgate Translation of the Bible. The N.T. he commenced at the request of Pope Damasus in 383; the O.T. was wholly revised and written at Bethlehem. "The New Testament," he says, "I have translated from the original Greek, and the Old Testament from the Hebrew[b]." His object was not to make a new version but to improve the many existing versions. "The old

[a] Theod. H.E. V. 30.

[b] Vir. Ill. 135.

flavour is not preserved" he writes in the Greek version of the LXX.; when we read passages in Greek they have *some* meaning, when in Latin they are utterly incomprehensible[c]; many passages were obscure, some "omitted, or at all events through the fault of copyists have been corrupted[d]."

St. Jerome is a Father not, as might have been expected, of the Greek, but of the Latin Church. To explain this we must again advert to the great events which had taken place in the Western world since the commencement of the century. The barbarian forces which, after Hadrianople, had threatened Constantinople, were diverted again against the Western Empire, and, A.D. 410, Alaric sacked Rome; in Jerome's own words[e]; "the city which had taken the whole world was itself taken; nay more, famine was beforehand with the sword, and but few of the citizens were left to be made captive." The disheartening condition of Rome and Italy drove many of the richer and nobler families to seek refuge in the Holy Land, and Jerome received at Bethlehem the tide of Western emigrants. "Every day," he wrote[f], "we are receiving in this holy Bethlehem men and women, who once were noble and abounding in every kind of wealth, but are now reduced to poverty." This greatly added to his labours; "there is not a single hour nor a single moment in which we are not receiving crowds of brethren;" "the burden of this holy work is as much as we can carry[g]." Thus it happened that the monk of Bethlehem, who would naturally have been a doctor of the Eastern, was claimed by the West, and became the chief doctor of the Western, Church; and, his remains

[c] Pref. Chron. [d] Pref. Job. [e] Ep. CXXVII. 12.
[f] Pref. Ezek. [g] Ibid.

are said to have been transferred from Bethlehem to the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome.

St. Jerome's is not a character that can be admired. That with vast knowledge and some virtues he combined many faults will generally be allowed; and that he was vain and jealous; passionate and violent in controversy; whilst his bitter hatred of his once-friend Rufinus pursuing him even after death, ("the scorpion," he styles him, "now underground [h]"), has left an indelible stain on his name.

On the death of Atticus one party in Constantinople favoured the election of Philip of Side in Pamphylia, another that of Proclus, a disciple and friend of St. Chrysostom; both however were passed over in favour of Sisinnius (Feb. 426—Dec. 427). So chagrined was Philip at the preference given to Sisinnius, that he introduced the matter into his *Χριστιανὴ Ἱστορία*; a work in which, says Socrates [i], he so calumniated both the elected and electors, that he could not commit his language to writing; a circumstance which renders the loss of his History less regretable than it otherwise might have been.

The Councils of Nicæa and Constantinople had established the doctrine of our Lord's Divinity; controversies next arose in the East with regard to His Human Nature.

On the death of Sisinnius, Philip of Side and Proclus (the latter of whom had in the meantime been appointed by Sisinnius bishop of Cyzicus), were again passed over; and Nestorius, a former pupil of Theodore of Mopsuestia (*Μόψου Ἑστία*; *hearth of Mopsus*, a son of Apollo), a monk of St. Euprepius near Constantinople, was conse-

[h] Ezek. B. II. [i] VII. 26.

crated Patriarch of Constantinople (428—431). Frequent mention of Theodore of Mopsuestia will be made further on in this work; we will only here state what Theodoret says of him[j]; "Six and thirty years he had spent in his bishopric, fighting against the forces of Arius and Eunomius; struggling against the piratical band of Apollinaris; and finding the best pastures for God's sheep."

Antioch more than any of the great sees had been troubled with heresy and schism. It was the first great see whose bishop, Paul of Samosata, (the Socinus, as he has been called, of the third century), was deposed for heresy. St. Lucian, one of the founders of the famous school of Antioch, from which the principal teachers of Arianism proceeded, held at one time the doctrine of Paul, and was excommunicated; on moderating his views he was reconciled to the Church and died a martyr; and a Creed composed by him is preserved by St. Athanasius and Socrates. Next followed the long Eustathian schism. Diodore, head of the school of Antioch, and afterwards (378—394) bishop of Tarsus, has been considered the father of both Nestorianism and Rationalism. His views were further developed by his pupil Theodore of Mopsuestia; and now from Antioch proceeded the Patriarch of Constantinople, who, having once been a pupil of Theodore, gave his name to the heresy.

At this time Cyril was Patriarch of Alexandria, Theodotus, to be succeeded by John (429—441), of Antioch, and Juvenal of Jerusalem. Nestorius took with him as his chaplain from Antioch, Anastasius, a follower of the teaching of Theodore. In a sermon preached November 22nd, 428, Anastasius used the words, "Let no one call

[j] H.E. V. 39.

Mary Theotokos (*God-bearing*)—it is impossible for God to be born of a human being." The people called upon Nestorius, who had already shown himself a zealous opponent of all sects (the Pelagians excepted), to discountenance the teaching. But Nestorius himself disliked the word Theotokos, as seeming to imply that the Godhead of Christ had its origin from the Virgin Mary; and in a sermon on the following Christmas Day, and in two sermons in January, he allowed that Mary was Christotokos but denied that she was Theotokos. At that stage of the controversy Nestorius probably meant to deny that Mary was the mother of the Godhead; in which Cyril would have agreed with him. The heresy attributed to Nestorius by Theophanes is evidently exaggerated [k]. Socrates, who had carefully read the works of Nestorius, says of him [l], that he was not a follower of Paul of Samosata, nor of Photinus; that he did not deny the Divinity of Christ; but that he "seemed alarmed at the term Theotokos, as if it was some terrible thing [m]."

The character of Cyril of Alexandria has not been handed down in favourable colours. In point of temper he was as irascible and bitter as his uncle Theophilus, and as eager to crush a rival Patriarch of Constantinople. The saying is attributed to him that he would as soon place on the Diptychs the name of Judas Iscariot as that of Chrysostom. He confiscated the property of the Novatians, and drove the Jews from Alexandria; and the cruel murder of Hypatia, which was imputed to the officers of his church, although there is no evidence of Cyril's complicity, has left a stain upon his name. But as the champion of Orthodoxy, he did a work cor-

[k] Chron. p. 61, Ed. Goar; "Ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον λέγων τὸν Κύριον."
[l] VII. 32. [m] μορμολυκεῖον; *bug-bear;* Lidd. and Scott.

responding to that of St. Athanasius; and but for him (to use the words of Dr. Wordsworth, the late Bishop of Lincoln), "the world would have been astounded and wondered to find itself Nestorian."

So keen was the rivalry for pre-eminence between the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Alexandria that, in the contest in which they engaged, both Cyril and Nestorius appealed to Celestine, Pope of Rome (421—431). The Pope sided with Cyril; and, at a Roman council in August, 430, condemned Nestorius; threatening him with excommunication, unless within ten days he should return to orthodoxy; and he commissioned Cyril to execute the sentence. An Alexandrian synod under Cyril endorsed the judgment of the Roman synod; and both Celestine and Cyril wrote to John of Antioch announcing their common action. John thereupon despatched a letter, supposed to have been composed by Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrrhos or Cyrus, in the Diocese of Antioch (423—458), to Nestorius, urging him to accept the Theotokos; a course which Cyril rendered difficult and impracticable by, in November, hurling against Nestorius twelve articles or chapters, couched in the form of anathematisms, drawn up in a synod at Alexandria. These savoured of Apollinarianism, and offended John and Theodoret, both of whom now sided with Nestorius. The Syrian Bishops took the same side; whilst Egypt, and especially the Egyptian monks, were foremost in the cause against Nestorius, and in favour of their own Patriarch.

Nestorius so far from humbling himself before the Pope, set both him and Cyril at defiance; and met Cyril's anathematisms with twelve anathemas of his own.

The Emperor Theodosius, who was under the influence of Nestorius, his own Patriarch, accused Cyril of being the

disturber of the peace; and being unwilling to allow the interference of the Pope of Rome, he, in his own name and in that of the Western Emperor, Valentinian III., issued, in November, an edict for a council to meet at Ephesus at Whitsuntide in the following year, with the view to remedying the troubles and disorder of the church. Pope Celestine, says Du Pin, the famous Doctor of the Sorbonne, was invited, like other bishops, to attend the Council. A Letter was sent inviting St. Augustine, the great bishop of Hippo; but in August, 430, before the Letter reached its destination, Augustine died.

After a winter spent in mutual recriminations, Cyril and Nestorius set out for Ephesus, Cyril arriving in the first week of June, to find Nestorius and Theodoret already there. The Syrian bishops being accidentally delayed, John wrote to Cyril apologizing for the delay, and saying that they might be expected in a few days. Theodoret, always the counsellor of peace, and Count Candidian, the Commissioner of both the Emperors, advocated delay. But Cyril was well aware that John was opposed to his anathematisms, and that the Antiochene bishops were favourable to Nestorius; it was probably from those reasons that he determined not to wait, and on June 22, 431, opened, in the Church of St. Mary at Ephesus, in which the body of the Virgin was supposed to rest, the Third Œcumenical Council.

One hundred and ninety-eight bishops, with Memnon, bishop of Ephesus, attended. Cyril, accompanied by his Archdeacon Dioscorus, presided at the request of Pope Celestine; Nestorius, though thrice summoned, refusing to attend. In session I., the Nicene Creed having been first read in its original form, the Council, without considering

itself bound by the Pope's judgment, entered on an examination of Nestorius' doctrine; and resolved;—"The Holy Synod declares that no one may put forth or compose a faith different from that which has been settled at Nicæa." After the Letter of Cyril to Nestorius containing the twelve anathematisms, and passages from sermons and other works of Nestorius, as well as statements from the Fathers, had been read, the unanimous sentence of the Council was pronounced; that they all anathematized the heretic Nestorius, and every one who would not anathematize him; and the judgment was subscribed by all present;—"Since the most impious Nestorius had refused to obey the citation, the Council was compelled (*ἀναγκαίως κατεπειχθέντες*) by the canons, in accordance with a letter of their most holy Father and colleague (*συλλειτούργου*), Celestine, bishop of the Roman Church, to pronounce with many tears (*δακρύσαντες πολλακίς*) the sorrowful sentence, that our Lord Jesus Christ, Whom he had blasphemed, decrees by this holy Synod that Nestorius is deposed from the episcopal rank, and from all priestly Communion." Candidian ordered the placards announcing the sentence to be torn down from the walls.

In session II. (July 9), the Pope himself being unable to attend[n], two legates took their seats, bearing a letter from the Pope which, on the motion of Cyril, was read, and the Council adopted the judgment passed in the previous session; and in session III., on the following day, excommunicated Nestorius.

John, arriving with his fourteen bishops five days after the first session, learnt with indignation the hasty pro-

[n] "Ob labores hyemali tempore in mari tolerandos." Theoph. Chron. p. 61.

ceedings of the Council, and the deposition of Nestorius; and, with the dust of the journey on his feet, held at his inn, by the connivance of Candidian, a "conciliabulum" (as his opponents called it), attended by forty bishops (amongst whom was Theodoret), but to which Memnon was in vain invited. This John and Candidian declared to be the Œcumenical Council, assembled by the Grace of God and command of the pious Emperors. Theodoret[o] says that Dioscorus, who was not likely to be prejudiced in his favour, spoke of the exact knowledge of divine doctrine possessed by John; but in his controversy with Cyril John does not shine; whilst he ultimately abandoned all that he had contended for.

John's council, in which Rabulas, the versatile bishop of Edessa[p], took a prominent part against Cyril, made no mention of Nestorius. It deposed and excommunicated Cyril and Memnon, the former on the ground that he held the errors of Apollinaris and Eunomius, and all who would not anathematise his anathematisms.

In session III. (July 11) of the Œcumenical Council, a synodal letter was drawn up, requesting Theodosius to appoint a bishop for Constantinople. In session V. (July 17), John and his council, and those who attended it, and amongst them Theodoret, were sentenced to excommunication, and suspension from their spiritual offices.

In session VI. (July 22), Charisius, Œconomus of the Church of Philadelphia, presented a Nestorian creed which two presbyters, coming from Constantinople, had imposed on some Philadelphian Quarto-decimans, who desired to conform to the Orthodox Church. The

[o] Ep. LXXXIII. [p] In succession to Diogenes.

Council adopted the Nicene Creed without the additions of Constantinople, and decreed that that alone should be used.

In session VII. (and last) the creed presented by Charisius was condemned. The rights of the Cypriot Church were considered and decided. The Cypriots, who formed part of the Patriarchate of Antioch, having, through their Metropolitan Reginus, Archbishop of Constantia, set forth that his predecessor Troilus had been harassed by the Antiochenes; and having proved to the satisfaction of the Council that, in the earliest ages, their bishops had been consecrated by the bishop of the Province, and not, as had for some time been the case, by the Bishop of Antioch, it was decided that "the Churches of Cyprus should be confirmed in their independence, and in their right to elect and consecrate their own bishops;" a right which was confirmed by the Trullan Council. Peter Fuller (see further on) re-asserted the rights of Antioch; but they were set aside, owing to the discovery in a grave near Constantia of the body of St. Barnabas, which was regarded as a proof of the Apostolic foundation of the Cypriot Church.

Eight canons were passed at the Council; I. and II. against John's (the apostatical) synod; III., IV., and V. against Nestorius, the Pelagian Celestine, and their adherents. By VII. it was declared that it was "unlawful for any man to propose, or subscribe, or make any other creed but what had been resolved on by the holy fathers assembled at Nicæa" (*τοὺς τολμῶντας συντιθέναι πίστιν ἑτέραν*); if a bishop or clergyman he should be deposed, if a layman anathematized [q].

[q] Canon VII. differs in form from the other canons, and is not strictly speaking a canon at all. It commences; *ὥρισεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος.*

Each party had excommunicated its opponents, and each forbade the other to perform their sacred offices. The perplexed Emperor cut the knot by combining the sentences of both; and in July ordered the deposition of Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius, Count John carrying the order to Ephesus; and the three were placed under arrest. In September deputations from both parties waited upon Theodosius, with the result that he veered round to the side of Orthodoxy, and the Œcumenical Council; Memnon was re-instated at Ephesus, and Cyril and the other prelates were ordered to return home. In October the Emperor consented to the consecration of the orthodox Maximian as Patriarch of Constantinople (431—434).

Nestorius, shunned on all sides, (even Theodoret, though he believed him to be innocent of the heresy imputed to him, condemning him as the cause of all the trouble), was allowed by the Emperor to return to the monastery of St. Euprepius; a favour which he gratefully acknowledged. In 433 a reconciliation was effected between the Antiochene and Alexandrian Churches, although Cyril stood firm in persisting on the recognition of Nestorius' deposition, his anathematization, and that of his heresy[r]. Early in July John wrote to Cyril abandoning Nestorius, recognizing his deposition, and anathematizing his impious teaching (*δυσφήμους αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας*); and he acquiesced in the appointment of Maximian.

On the death of Maximian the adherents of Nestorius demanded his restoration; but the Emperor, who had now become as violent an anti-Nestorian as he had been before in Nestorius' favour, insisted on the appointment of the

[r] Theod. Ep. CLXXVII.

gentle and saintly Proclus (434—437), who, the people of Cyzicus having refused to receive him as their bishop, was living in Constantinople. Proclus (434—437) was accordingly appointed and performed the funeral obsequies of his predecessor [s].

The residence of Nestorius in his monastery in the neighbourhood of Antioch being a standing reproach to the Patriarch John, he was banished, first to the Oasis of Libya, and in 435 to Petra in Arabia; and afterwards being dragged about from place to place, and undergoing cruelties which remind us of those of St. Chrysostom, he died worn out by his sufferings, but where or at what date is uncertain [t].

Reference has been made above to the Pelagian heresy. Pelagianism, or the denial of Original Sin, is the heresy condemned in our fourteenth Article. Though it had its origin in the East, and its author was Rufinus, known as the Syrian [u] (to distinguish him from Rufinus the historian), Pelagianism was, and had the character of, a Western heresy. The controversies of the East were generally with regard to subtle matters of theological speculation, such as the relation of the Persons in the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Union of the Divine and Human Natures in our Lord; whereas those of the West were of a more practical character, such as Original Sin, Predestination, and the free-will of man.

Rufinus, one of Jerome's community at Bethlehem, was, in 390, sent by him on a mission to Rome, where he openly broached the doctrine, that Adam's Fall did not affect his descendants, but that man can, of his own

[s] Soc. VII. 40.

[t] But not before 439 when Socrates completed his History. Soc. VII. 39.

[u] Mentioned, Hieron. Ep. LXXXI. 2, to Rufinus of Aquileia.

free-will, do works pleasing and acceptable unto God. "To maintain such a doctrine," says St. Jerome[x], "is to take away man's Nature." Though Pelagianism originated in the East, it exercised comparatively little influence on the Eastern, whilst it convulsed the Western, Church.

Pelagius, (*sea-born;* a Grecised form of the name *Morgan*), a British monk, was, about A.D. 401, inoculated at Rome in the doctrine of Rufinus, which he instilled into the mind of an Irish monk named Celestine, who also was at the time in Rome. The heresy which took his name was a reaction from the Augustinian doctrine of Grace. The sad experience of his own life led St. Augustine to profess the total inability in the unregenerate man, as the consequence of Adam's fall, of not sinning, and to repose everything on the Grace, limited by the Predestination, of God. Pelagius found at Rome the prevalence of the sins which had driven St. Jerome from it; and he heard people excusing themselves on the ground of the weakness and corruption of their nature.

What Pelagius professed to be his teaching was that, without maintaining that any person ever lived sinless from infancy to old age, yet that he might so live *by the Grace of God.* It is a characteristic of the Eastern Church to obey rather than to define; its tendency has always been to lay stress on the freedom of the human will; and in the Pelagian controversy it was inclined to accept the co-operation of Grace and free-will, without defining their limits.

In 412 the Pelagian doctrine was condemned in an

[x] Ep. CXXXIII.

African synod presided over by Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage; and in the same year St. Augustine wrote his first Treatise against Pelagianism. From Carthage the controversy was transferred to Palestine, where Pelagius had gone to reside. In 415 he was accused by Orosius, a Spanish presbyter sent by Augustine, before a synod at Jerusalem under John II., at which Pelagius was allowed to defend himself. His teaching was ruled to be in agreement with the Orthodox Church, John arguing that, as Pelagius taught that man could live free from sin, but not without the Grace of God, to deny it would be to deny the efficacy of Divine Grace. Such also was the result of a synod at Diospolis (*Lydda*), at the end of the same year, under Eulogius, the successor of Gelasius in the see of Cæsarea, his accusers being two Gallican Bishops.

In 416 two councils, one at Carthage the other at Milevum in Numidia, condemned Pelagianism.

Praylius, the successor of John of Jerusalem, wrote to Pope Innocent I. (402—417), expressing his belief in the orthodoxy of Pelagius and Celestine. But the decisions of the two councils having been sent to him, Innocent excommunicated both Pelagius and Celestine; and it was this that drew from St. Augustine, (not the apophthegm attributed to him, "*Roma locuta, causa finita,*" but) the words; "Two Councils on Pelagianism have been reported to the Holy See. The cause is ended[y]."

Innocent was succeeded by Zosimus (417 — 418), a Greek and an Origenist, to which party Pelagius had, when in Rome, attached himself, not considering himself bound by the judgment of his predecessor. He re-heard

[y] Serm. CXXXI.

the case; allowed himself to be won over by Celestine, reversed the judgment of Innocent, and pronounced Pelagianism to be Catholic. In 418, through the influence of St. Augustine, the civil power intervened; the Emperor Honorius in the West and Arcadius in the East issued a rescript against the Pelagians; Zosimus investigated the matter afresh; condemned with great severity the doctrine of Pelagius and Celestine as being opposed to the Catholic faith; and it was condemned, as we have seen, by the third Œcumenical Council. Two Patriarchs of Constantinople, Atticus and Sisinnius, likewise opposed the heresy; and the very first letter of Pope Leo was addressed to the Bishop of Aquileia, blaming him for his remissness in dealing with the Pelagian heresy.

To return to what more immediately concerns the Greek Church. The reconciliation of John and Cyril was soon followed by a reconciliation of the latter and Theodoret; Theodoret, on careful examination, was satisfied with Cyril's disavowal of Apollinarianism, although he still refused to throw over Nestorius. But between the violence of Cyril and the gentleness of Theodoret there was little in common; another quarrel, on the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, broke out between the two, Cyril attacking and Theodoret defending them; and the quarrel was only ended by the death of Cyril in 444.

Proclus, as was before said, succeeded Maximian as Patriarch of Constantinople, and at his request the body of St. Chrysostom was, in January, 437, translated with great honour from Comana to Constantinople, "the faithful crowd turning the sea, as it were, into land by their closely-packed boats[z];" and the Emperor Theodosius

[z] Theod. V. 36.

and his sisters, who took part in the function, asking the pardon of Heaven for the grievous wrong inflicted by their parents on the sainted bishop. In 446 Pulcheria translated to Constantinople the relics of "the Forty Martyrs[a]."

Cyril was succeeded in the see of Alexandria by his Archdeacon Dioscorus (444—dep. 449); John of Antioch was succeeded by his nephew Domnus II. (441—449); on the death of St. Proclus Flavian was consecrated Patriarch of Constantinople; Juvenal was still Bishop of Jerusalem.

Theodosius now exchanged the salutary guidance of Pulcheria for that of his unscrupulous Prime Minister, Chrysaphius (443—450), through bribery of whom it was supposed that Dioscorus obtained the Patriarchate; and it was said that he was consecrated by only two bishops.

Theodoret, writing to Dioscorus[b], soon after his consecration to the Patriarchate, speaks of "the many forms of virtue by which we hear your Holiness is adorned." Socrates says[c] that Cyril had greater power than Theophilus ever exercised; that from his time the bishopric of Alexandria exceeded the limits of its sacerdotal functions, and assumed the administration of secular matters. The elevation of Dioscorus to almost alsolute power (for such the position of the Patriarch of Alexandria at the time was) had on him a disastrous effect, so that, whatever he might have been at the commencement of his Patriarchate, he became a violent, unscrupulous, and immoral man.

Whilst treating the family of Cyril with gross injustice

[a] Forty soldiers who suffered under the Emperor Licinius at Sebaste. For a full account of the translation, see Sozomen IX. 2.

[b] Ep. LX. [c] VII. 7.

and cruelty, Dioscorus prided himself on being the heir of Cyril's anti-Nestorian zeal, and the champion of his twelve Articles. He outvied Cyril in his enmity to Theodoret; "he stood up in church and anathematized him[d]," because Theodoret would not anathematize Nestorius.

Having through means of Chrysaphius gained the ear of the Emperor, Dioscorus at once set himself to ruining Theodoret, a handle being given him by the heresy of Eutyches, the Godfather of Chrysaphius, which was then coming into prominence.

Nestorianism had found no stronger opponent, nor Cyril a more zealous adherent, than Eutyches, who for seventy years had been an inmate, and now was Archimandrite, of a monastery at Constantinople. But in avoiding the Scylla of the Two Natures he fell into the Charybdis of attributing only one Nature to Christ. Eusebius, now bishop of Dorylæum in Phrygia (the accuser twenty years before of Nestorius), demanded that Eutyches should be brought before a synod (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*), which was arranged to meet for other business, at Constantinople, in November, 448. In vain the gentle and peace-loving Flavian advised that they who, as opponents of Nestorius, had been friends, should arrange the matter privately. Eusebius remaining obdurate, the synod reluctantly consented to summon Eutyches, who again and again excused himself from appearing, till threatened by Flavian with deposition. Interrogated by the Imperial commissioner who attended the synod, Eutyches, having professed his agreement with the Nicene faith as confirmed at Ephesus, professed his belief that our Lord before the union of the Godhead and Manhood

[d] Theod. Ep. LXXXVI.

(πρὸ τῆς ἑνώσεως) had two Natures, but after the union (μετὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν) only one; he was then sentenced to excommunication and deprivation. He presented a writ of appeal which Flavian refused to receive [e].

On September 29, 440, Leo I. (the Great), a deacon, was appointed in succession to Sixtus III., Pope of Rome (440—460). It was a critical time both for Church and State. The Arian barbarians were encompassing the Roman Empire; the Western Empire was tottering to its fall; the Western Church was harassed by Pelagianism; the Eastern by Nestorianism. And now a new trouble arose in the heresy of Eutyches. Hitherto the most notable defenders of the faith had proceeded from the Greek Church; Leo, though thoroughly ignorant of Greek [f], was the most able bishop, the first eminent theologian that had presided over the see of Rome; his intervention with Attila and the Huns in 452, and in 455 with the Vandal Genseric, belong to civil history; but his personal character and unflinching orthodoxy marked him out as the very man whom the present circumstances of the Church required, raised up in the providence of God to give the coping-stone to the doctrine of the Incarnation.

On February 18, 449, Leo wrote to Flavian [g] stating that Eutyches had complained to him that he had been wrongfully deprived of Communion, and asked for further information. As a reply to Flavian's answer the Pope drew up a famous Letter known as *the Tome* [h], which, as opposed to both Nestorianism and Eutychianism, clearly set forth the orthodox doctrine of the One Person

[e] Leo, Ep. XXI.
[f] Ibid. Epp. CXIII. 4; CXXX. 3.
[g] Ep. XXIII.
[h] Ibid. XXVIII.

of God and Man ; the inferiority of the Son as touching the Manhood, His equality as touching the Godhead.

The monks rallied round their Archimandrite Eutyches, who, through Chrysaphius, gained the favour, whilst Flavian fell under the disfavour, of the Emperor; and at the request of Dioscorus and Eutyches, Theodosius, in his own name and in that of the Western Emperor, summoned the General Council, to which the name of Latrocinium (*σύνοδος ληστική* ; *robber-council*) has ever attached; "a meeting not of judges but of robbers[i]," which cannot and does not deserve the name of Synod[j]. Meanwhile Dioscorus obtained two Imperial edicts against Theodoret as "a restless and turbulent man," the first confining him to his Diocese, the second forbidding him to attend the council.

The second Council of Ephesus (Latrocinium) met on August 8, 449, in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, the same church in which the third Œcumenical Council had sat. Pope Leo sent to the council three legates[k], Julius, bishop of Puteoli, Renatus, a presbyter, who, as no mention of him is made in the documents of the council, is supposed to have died on the road, and Hilary, a deacon[l]. The council was at first attended by about 130 bishops.

Dioscorus, the enemy of Flavian and friend of Eutyches, by order of the Emperor presided. The next seat of honour was given to Julius ; Juvenal occupied the third place ; Domnus of Antioch the fourth ; whilst only

[i] Leo, Ep. XCV. 2. [j] Ibid. Ep. LXXXV. 1.

[k] "De Latere;" Leo. Ep. XXXII. ; "ex latere," Ep. XXXIV. 2.

[l] The Letter (Ep. CXVI.) addressed by Theodoret to Renatus, praising the boldness of his speech at the council, as his name is not mentioned in the body of the Letter, was perhaps intended for Hilarius.

the fifth place was given to Flavian, the head of the Greek Church.

The council, which Dioscorus had packed with gross unfairness, was marked by disorder from the first. The Emperor had ordered Candidian not to admit monks to the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus; by express order of the Emperor, Barsumas, a furious Eutychian Abbot, went to the Latrocinium, and, attended by 1,000 disorderly monks, coerced the council; Dioscorus throughout acting the part of a violent partizan, and abetting the ring-leaders.

The Pope's Letter was handed in by Hilary, but laid aside unread. No new form, Dioscorus said, was needed beyond the decrees of Nicæa and Ephesus. When Flavian proposed that Eusebius, the accuser of Eutyches, should be heard, the reasonable proposal was opposed by the Imperial Commissioner Elpidius, who had the support of Dioscorus, and was negatived. The weak Domnus, who in a synodal letter to the Emperor had been the first to impeach Eutyches, now expressed his regret for having condemned him. The end was that Eutyches was acquitted, his doctrine pronounced to be in accordance with the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus, and the sentence of the late council was reversed, Domnus and Juvenal concurring in the judgment.

The council attacked Theodoret as the enemy of the Council of Ephesus and of the writings of Cyril, Dioscorus leading the attack against him, as "an impious wretch" whose impiety was of long standing; who by his false teaching had led astray innumerable souls. Theodoret was sentenced to be deprived not only of his Orders but of lay Communion, and his books to be burnt; the sentence being approved by Domnus, whose own deposition was

to follow the next day; "They ought to have convicted me to my face," writes Theodoret [m], "not slandered me behind my back."

The question was now raised whether Flavian and Eusebius ought not to suffer the punishment to which they had sentenced Eutyches. "It follows," Dioscorus said, "that Flavian of Constantinople and Eusebius of Dorylæum be deposed from their ecclesiastical dignity; I therefore pronounce their deposition." Domnus and Juvenal subscribed the judgment. In vain Flavian, in vain the Papal legates, protested; a fearful scene of terrorism followed. Dioscorus accused the bishops who opposed him with exciting sedition; and he called in the Imperial soldiers to coerce those who refused to subscribe the sentence. Terrorized by the threats of Dioscorus and the blows of the monks and soldiers, 135 bishops, (by compulsion as they afterwards declared), eventually subscribed. Flavian brutally beaten and kicked by the agents of Dioscorus and Eutyches was sentenced to deposition, and exiled to Epipas in Lydia, where he only survived his savage treatment three days. Ibas of Edessa, a friend of Theodoret, was, in his absence, sentenced to deposition for Nestorianism, and banished.

Dioscorus next took vengeance on those who, though they had supported him at the Latrocinium, had previously opposed him, and Domnus, another friend of Theodoret [n], was deposed and retired into a monastery. As a just punishment for their part in the Council the names of Domnus and Juvenal were erased from the Orthodox Diptychs.

[m] Ep. CXLV.

[n] Theod. Ep. CX.

Eusebius of Dorylæum managed to effect his escape to Rome.

The papal legate Julius, although he had opposed the deposition of Flavian, had otherwise borne a less conspicuous part at the council than Hilary, and was left in peace and safety. Hilary quited the council with the simple word *contradicitur;* threatened by Dioscorus he with difficulty made his escape to Rome, as he wrote to Pulcheria "*per incognita et invia loca*[o]," leaving his property at Ephesus; and lived to succeed Leo as Pope (461—468). Condemned by the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church, Theodoret had none to appeal to except the head of the Western Church; he wrote to Pope Leo[p]; "I await the decision of the Holy See, and I supplicate and beseech your Holiness to succour me who invoke your righteous and just tribunal."

The Latrocinium, which in all its outer circumstances was a General Council, bears out our twenty-first Article, that "General Councils may err and sometimes have erred even in things pertaining unto God." To such a height of presumption and arrogance was Dioscorus, now master of the Eastern Church, raised, that he headed ten bishops of his Patriarchate in excommunicating Pope Leo, the head of the Western Church.

Anatolius, the Apocrisiarius of Dioscorus, was, through the interest of the latter with Chrysaphius, appointed to succeed Flavian as Patriarch of Constantinople, (449—458), Pope Leo at first refusing to recognize him. Maximus, chosen by Dioscorus, was appointed by the Emperor to succeed Domnus at Antioch, (449—455), without the clergy and people being consulted, and was conse-

[o] Leo, Ep. XLVI. [p] Ep. LII.

crated by Anatolius, who, Leo complained, had thus exceeded his jurisdiction [q].

It was impossible that such a scandal as the Latrocinium could be allowed to stand. In October, 449, and again in July, 450, Leo wrote [r] to Theodosius proposing that a universal Council should be held in Italy, according to the canonical decree passed at Nicæa (a mistake on the part of the Pope for Sardica), as Flavian had appealed to Rome [s]. There was no other Patriarch that he, condemned as he was in the East, could appeal to. The Western Emperor Valentinian III. and his mother Galla Placidia, when in Rome in 450 for the Festival of St. Peter, were persuaded by Leo to use their influence with the Eastern Emperor; but Theodosius adhered to, and confirmed, the Latrocinium; he maintained that Flavian, Eusebius, and Domnus had been, as holders of Nestorianism, justly condemned.

On July 29, 450, Theodosius was killed by what Gibbon calls "the fortunate stumbling of his horse." Pulcheria then became Empress (450—453). The ban was at once removed from Theodoret [t]; and Chrysaphius was executed. In the same year Pulcheria married her soldier-husband Marcian, who was crowned Emperor (450—457), and proved one of the ablest and most virtuous Princes that ever ruled the Roman Empire.

Both Marcian and Pulcheria were orthodox; the predominance of Dioscorus came to an end, and Orthodoxy triumphed. The obstacle to a council being now removed, Marcian acceded to the petition made by Leo (but afterwards revoked), and consented that a council should be

[q] Ep. CIV. [r] Epp. XLIV., LXIX. [s] The same mistake occurs in Ep. LVIII. [t] Theod. Ep. CXXXIX.

held to remedy the harm done by the Latrocinium, and a schism which had arisen in the Eastern Church between the followers of Flavian and the followers of Dioscorus. But he met the Pope's request that it should be held in Italy "by a gently expressed refusal [u];" at the bidding of the two Emperors, 529 bishops met, first at Nicæa on September 1, 451; but, for the convenience of Marcian, who was engaged in his operations against Attila and the Huns, the council was transferred to Chalcedon.

The Fourth Œcumenical Council, more numerously attended than the other three (the Council in its letter to Leo places the number at "520 priests"), met on October 8, 451, in the Church of St. Euphemia; under "the protection of the most holy and beautiful Martyr Euphemia;" to whose prayers the synodal letter ascribed the success of the council; she "crowned the meeting as for a bride (*νυμφῶνι*), and subscribed its definition as her own confession to her Bridegroom (Christ), through the most religious Emperor and Christ-loving Empress [v].

As the Pope's wishes, first that the council should be held in Italy, and afterwards that there should be no council at all, had been disregarded, Marcian would naturally be inclined to make some amends to one who had made so firm a stand for Orthodoxy and against the Latrocinium. This may account for the fact that, together with the Imperial Commissioners, a Papal legate (Paschasinus) presided (and that for the first time) at an Œcumenical Council. Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople, had the next place of honour; then Maximus, the successor of Domnus at Antioch. The Papal legates demanded in the Pope's name that Dioscorus should be

[u] Leo, Ep. XCV. [v] Ibid. CI.

excluded; this the Imperial Commissioners refused to allow; but he was compelled to sit in the middle of the assembly. The last place of honour (but not till after the fourth session) was accorded to the time-serving Juvenal, who, finding that his name was erased from the diptychs of churches, returned to the side of Orthodoxy.

There were 16 sessions, the last being held on November 1.

Session I. was marked by rioting rivalling the Latrocinium. No sooner did Theodoret enter than the party of Dioscorus shouted that the teacher of Nestorianism should be turned out. The Orthodox bishops declared that they had been beaten and forced to subscribe the Latrocinium, and shouted "turn out the enemies of Flavian" — "the homicide Dioscorus." The Imperial Commissioners begged them to remember that they were bishops. The minutes of the Latrocinium were then read. When it was found that only the fifth place had been given to Flavian, Paschasinus recognised the right of the Patriarch of Constantinople to the next place after the Papal legates; "we will, please God, recognise the present bishop of Constantinople as first." At the end of the session the commissioners first expressed the adherence of their "divine sovereigns" to the Creed of the 318, and next to the Creed of the 150, Fathers.

In session II. (Oct. 10) Eunomius, bishop of Nicomedia, first recited the early form of the Nicene Creed, to which the bishops exclaimed, "this is the orthodox faith; this we all believe, into this we were baptized." Aetius, Archdeacon of Constantinople, then read "the holy faith which the 150 Fathers set forth as consonant to the holy and great synod of Nicæa," to which the bishops assented;

"this is the faith of all of us; we all so believe." This appears to be the first recognition of the amplified form of the Nicene Creed; and the Creed, as recited at Chalcedon, was received by the Catholic Church throughout the world.

In session III., from which the Imperial Commissioners were absent, Dioscorus, who though thrice summoned refused to appear, was accused by Eusebius; and the sentence was pronounced by the Papal legates, that "the most holy Archbishop of Rome has through us and this holy synod deprived him of his episcopal and all other spiritual dignity, on account of his disregard of the divine canons, and of his disobedience to this holy and Œcumenical Synod, and on account of other crimes of which he has been found guilty." (This is the only Œcumenical Council at which Papal legates presided, which accounts for the higher power than elsewhere being attributed to the Pope of Rome.)

In session IV. (Oct. 17) the Tome of Pope Leo was subscribed. The Egyptian bishops, thirteen in number, consented to anathematize Eutyches, but refused to subscribe the Tome, on the ground that they were only few in comparison with the great number of bishops in Egypt; and that the custom of their Church forbade them to act whilst their Archbishopric was vacant. At this session five bishops (and amongst them Juvenal), who had been deprived in the first session for their part at the Latrocinium, were allowed to retain their seats.

In session V. (Oct. 21) Aetius read a formula drawn up by a committee of the synod, which was approved. "It brought to nought," as Leo wrote to Juvenal[v], "the

[v] Ep. CXXXIX.

accursed judgment" of the Latrocinium. It again recited the Creed of the 318 and of the 150 Fathers, and the regulations of the first Council of Ephesus; it condemned several errors, amongst them the denial of the Theotokos, but refused to add that Mary was Theotokos, for the reason of the unalterableness of the Creed of the Church; it condemned the confusion of the two Natures; and it set a clear exposition of the faith as held by the Eastern and Western Churches;—"We with one consent (*συμφώνως*) teach men to confess one and the same Son, the Lord Jesus Christ; perfect in Godhead, perfect in Manhood, truly God and truly Man, of a reasonable soul and body (*ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος*); co-essential with the Father as touching the Godhead, and co-essential with us as touching the Manhood; in all things like unto us, sin only excepted; begotten of His Father before all ages, as touching the Godhead, and in these latter days for us men and our salvation, born of Mary the Virgin, the God-bearer, as touching the Manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, only-Begotten, to be recognized (*γνωριζόμενον*) in two Natures, without confusion (*ἀσυγχύτως*), without change (*ἀτρέπτως*), without division (*ἀδιαιρέτως*), without separation (*ἀχωρίστως*)—not parted or divided into two Persons, but one and the same Son, only-Begotten, God the Logos, the Lord Jesus Christ, even as we have been taught from the beginning by the Prophets and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and the Creed of the Fathers has delivered to us."

In session VI. (Oct. 25), at which Marcian and Pulcheria were present, the former delivering a speech in Latin, the formula approved in the former session was subscribed.

By canon VII. of Nicæa an honorary precedence had

been given to Ælia (*Jerusalem*), saving the rights of the Metropolitan see of Cæsarea. The long quarrel between Acacius and Cyril of Jerusalem was mainly due to the higher claim of the latter on account of Jerusalem being an Apostolical see[x]. The great object of Juvenal during his long, but not very creditable, episcopate was to get his see raised to a Patriarchate. He had made an attempt at the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, but was opposed by Cyril of Alexandria, and failed; and Cyril wrote to Pope Leo, who was at the time Archdeacon of Rome, complaining of Juvenal's presumption[y]. This was now effected in the seventh session (October 26); Jerusalem was raised to the rank of a Patriarchal see; the three Provinces of Palestine—Palestina Prima, which comprised, amongst other sees, Diospolis (the ancient *Lydda*), and Nicopolis (*Emmaus*), Jerusalem, and Cæsarea; Palestina Secunda; and Palestina Tertia—were placed under the new Patriarchate, which never at any time comprised quite fifty sees; Antioch still retaining possession of Arabia and Phœnicia.

Juvenal had at the Latrocinium subscribed before Domnus; elated probably by this success, he now put forth an arrogant claim for precedence over Antioch; this however was opposed by Maximus, and failed.

In session VIII. (Oct. 26, the same day as the seventh session), the case of Theodoret was brought forward, and he was required, as the condition of being "worthy of his see," to anathematize Nestorius. Wearied out by menaces, Theodoret gave way, and, after some demur, exclaimed, "Anathema to Nestorius, and to every one who refuses to call the holy Virgin Theotokos, or who

[x] Soz. IV. 25.

[y] Leo, Ep. CXIX. 4.

divides the only-Begotten Son into two." He was then pronounced to be orthodox, and his restoration to his see confirmed.

In the ninth (Oct. 27) and tenth sessions (Oct. 28), Ibas, who had been deposed at the Latrocinium, was, on subscribing the Tome of Leo and anathematizing Nestorius, pronounced orthodox.

In the fifteenth session (October 31st) thirty canons were drawn up, of which IX., XVII., and XXVIII., must be specially mentioned, as giving extraordinary prerogatives to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Canon V. of Nicæa provided for the holding a provincial synod twice a year for the purpose of hearing appeals. The Council of Chalcedon claimed for Constantinople an Apostolic foundation; and it spoke of "*ἀποστολίκου τούτου θρόνου*;" (probably owing to the tradition that St. Andrew founded the Church of Byzantium, and appointed Stachys its first bishop).

Canons IX. and XVII. allowed appeals to the Exarch of the Diocese (*ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως*; Diocese = a group of Provinces), with a final appeal to the Patriarch of Constantinople. An Œcumenical Council thus accorded a higher privilege to the Patriarch of Constantinople than was given by an inferior Council, that of Sardica, to Pope Julius; a bishop or cleric might in first instance bring a case against his Metropolitan before the Patriarch[z].

Most important of all is Canon XXVIII. In 445 the Emperor Valentinian III. constituted the Bishop of Rome

[z] Canon IX.; "*ἢ τὸν ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς Βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινοπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω.*" Canon XVII.; "*Παρὰ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τῷ Κωνσταντινοπόλεως θρόνῳ δικαζέσθω, καθὰ προείρηται.*"

the chief authority in the Western Church. Theodoret's famous letter[a] to Pope Leo ascribed the precedence of the see of Rome to three causes: Rome's civic greatness; its orthodoxy; and its containing the tombs of SS. Peter and Paul. Canon XXVIII. of Chalcedon, after reciting Canon III. of Constantinople, enacted;—"We, following in all respects the decrees (ὅρους) of the holy Fathers, and knowing (γνωρίζοντες) the recently-read canon of the 150 bishops beloved of God, decree and vote the same as they did concerning the privileges (περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων) of the most holy Church of Constantinople, which is New Rome. For the Fathers have with good reason granted its privileges to the see of Old Rome, on account of its being the Imperial City (διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν); and the 150 Fathers most beloved of God, acting under the same consideration, have given the same privileges to the most holy see of New Rome, judging with reason that the city which is the seat of Empire, and is equal to the Imperial Rome in other privileges, should be honoured as she is, as being the second and next after her (δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην); and that the Metropolitans, not only of the Provinces of Pontus and Asia, (Ephesus therefore, and Cæsarea), and Thrace, be ordained by the most holy throne of Constantinople, but even the bishops of the Dioceses which lie among the barbarians." The synodal letter to Pope Leo[b] mentions this as being a long existing custom; and Theodoret speaks of St. Chrysostom exercising jurisdiction over the whole of Thrace, Asia and Pontus. This right was now confirmed by the Council; and it was again confirmed by the 36th Canon of the Trullan Council.

At the end of Session 14 Aetius gave notice that the

[a] See p. 141.

[b] Leo, Ep. CVIII. 4.

Church of Constantinople had important matters to bring before the Council in the next session, for which he requested the Papal legates to be in their places. Canons IX. and XVII., giving appellate jurisdiction to Constantinople, had already been passed; but the legates, though thus forearmed and forewarned, knowing probably that they would be in a minority, refused to attend the session, on the ground that "they had received no instructions." In the sixteenth and last session (Nov. 1), though the legates assented to the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, Paschasinus remonstrated against the XXVIIIth Canon. The Imperial Secretary than read the resolution signed by 192 bishops, including the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem. Lucentius then asserted that the bishops had been forced to sign; whereupon he was met with an indignant denial: "no one had been forced," they exclaimed. Paschasinus then read a version of a canon which he professed was the sixth of Nicæa, that "the Roman Church always had the primacy." The Commissioners then again brought the matter forward; again the bishops declared that they acted voluntarily, and when the Commissioners requested them to express their wishes with regard to the canon, they exclaimed that they all stood by the decision. The Commissioners closed the Council with the remark that the Synod had again agreed to the prerogative granted to Constantinople.

The synodal letter which the legates took with them to Rome informed the Pope that the Council had ratified the canon of the 150 Fathers, and ordained that after Rome the Apostolic see of Constantinople should have the precedence, notwithstanding the violent resistance of his delegates.

The canon was reasonable, perhaps inevitable. The see

of Alexandria since the death of Athanasius, even though it increased in power, had been losing caste. The conduct of Peter and Timothy in the matter of Maximus the Cynic had compromised its dignity ; and the third canon of the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople had foreshadowed what might happen, when it decreed the second rank after Rome to Constantinople. With Cyril, Alexandria regained much that it had lost, and under him, at the time that Leo became Pope, the see of Alexandria was probably reputed the highest of the Patriarchates of Christendom ; so that Cyril's successor Dioscorus could make his boast, that "the country belonged to him rather than to the rulers," (*τῶν κρατούντων* [c]).

Such a preponderating power might be, and indeed, under such men as Theophilus and Dioscorus, was dangerous. The odious character and disgraceful fall of the latter, and with it the fall of the Patriarchate of Alexandria, led the Council of Chalcedon to seek a counterpoise; to endorse the prerogative given to the see of Constantinople by the second Œcumenical Council; and to place the Patriarch of Constantinople in the East on a level with the Pope of Rome, on the ground that it was New Rome and the Imperial City.

The Church having confirmed the precedence of Constantinople, Marcian gave the canon the Imperial imprimatur by a decree that it would be an insult to the holy Council to subject what it had decreed "to fresh examination and public dispute; since that which it has defined concerning the faith agrees with the doctrine of the 318 Fathers, and the regulation of the 150 Fathers."

The Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, alarmed

[c] Smith's Dict. Christ. Biog. under Dioscorus.

at the growing pretensions of Rome, accepted the canon. Julian, Bishop of Cos, the life-long friend of Leo, who attended the Council by his authority (although in what capacity is not known), approved of it; and, although he drew on himself a gentle reprimand [d], Leo appointed him his apocrisiarius at Constantinople.

Leo, as is well known, was ignorant of Greek; on March, 453, he wrote to Julian to send him a translation of the transactions of the Council. After the recitation of the Creed in its longer and shorter forms, the Council repeated what had before been decreed at Ephesus; that "it shall be unlawful for any one to bring forward a different confession of faith, whether by writing, or composing, or holding, or teaching others [e]." How can the Roman Church reconcile with this its introduction (in which it was unfortunately joined by the Anglican Church, when it was in Communion with Rome) of the Filioque into the Nicene Creed? Leo refused to accept the XXVIIIth Canon, but accepted the doctrinal decrees of the Council. The canon, he said, was in direct contradiction of Nicæa (a slip for Sardica), and assented to through an extorted signature [f]. This was a purely gratuitous assertion on the part of the Pope; for it was contradicted, as we have seen, in the presence of his legates, who must have acquainted him with the fact; the vote of precedence was renewed before the Commissioners; and the synodal letter informed the Pope that it was passed under the resistance of his legates.

The Pope wrote angry letters to Marcian, Pulcheria, and Anatolius [g]; he complained of "the haughty ar-

[d] Leo, Ep. CVII.
[e] See *Church Quart. Rev.*, Jan. 1901.
[f] Ibid.
[g] Epp. CIV., CV., CVI.

rogance" of Anatolius, as "tending to the disturbance of the Church;" of his having corrupted and intimidated the Council; of his being "puffed up with a self-seeking spirit;" of the canon over-ruling the Council of Nicæa; he told Anatolius he must be contented with being the bishop of the Imperial residence, he could not make it an "Apostolic see;" and "it was the Apostolic origin which gives the right to higher hierarchical rank." He had, he told him, usurped the rights of Alexandria and Antioch; it was by his (the Pope's) favour that he had obtained the see; that in opposition to all the canons he had consecrated a bishop for Antioch; that the canon of Constantinople had never been brought to the knowledge of the Apostolic see (this is repeated in a letter[h] of St. Gregory the Great); and by the authority of Peter he annulled the canon. Ultimately, however, Leo gave way; he wrote to Marcian[i] giving his consent "as a loyal subject to the acts of Chalcedon;" and he wrote to Pulcheria[k] to the same effect.

It was only natural that the Pope should object to the canon. So long as the contest for precedence between Alexandria and Constantinople continued, the Popes were able to lay the foundation of their mediæval supremacy; whereas now the Œcumenical Patriarchs of New Rome would be able to meet the pretensions of Old Rome on equal terms, and be better able to carry on that struggle for precedence in which we shall soon find them engaged.

Anatolius adhered to the canon because "it was decreed by the whole Council." And he had the best of the case; for the Œcumenical character of the Council

[h] Ep. LXXIII. 4. [i] Ibid. CXV. [k] Ibid. CXVI.

of Chalcedon has never been doubted by the Catholic Church either in the East or West; and both the Eastern and Western Churches profess that the Œcumenical Councils sat under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Leo himself expressly states this with regard to the Council of Chalcedon; so that if one part of the Council is to be accepted on that ground, the whole must be accepted also. And Leo's great successor, Gregory I., declared[1] that he received and revered, as the four Books of the Gospel, the four Councils.

The Council of Chalcedon intensified rather than allayed theological difficulties. Out of it grew the great monophysite controversy, during which the council was accepted or rejected according to the bias of the reigning Emperor. The first opposition to the Council came from Jerusalem, where Juvenal had in 452 to give place to a disreputable monophysite monk named Theodosius. A native of Alexandria, and perhaps one of the gang of turbulent monks whom Barsumas took to the Latrocinium, Theodosius afterwards attended the Council of Chalcedon. Hurrying away from Chalcedon to Jerusalem he persuaded the monks that the Council had betrayed the true faith, and favoured Nestorianism; and he found a patroness in Eudocia, the widow of Theodosius II., who was living in retirement at Jerusalem, and held monophysite views. Juvenal fled to Constantinople, and for twenty months Theodosius held the see. Eudocia having been converted to Orthodoxy by Euthymius, the famous anchorite of Palestine, and Pope Leo having written to her[m] to use her influence with the monks, Juvenal was enabled to recover his see,

[1] Ep. XXV.

[m] Ibid. CXXIII.

Theodosius taking refuge amongst the monks of Mount Sinai.

Far more serious schisms arose in the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch.

The population of Egypt was made up of two distinct races, the native Copts and the Greek residents; the latter accepted the decrees of Chalcedon; to the former the Council was particularly hateful because it seemed to them to reflect on their champion St. Cyril: because Cyril condemned the two Natures, they took it for granted that he must have held their doctrine of the one Nature. St. Proterius, Arch-Priest of Alexandria, whom Dioscorus had left in charge of the Patriarchate during his absence, was elected by Imperial mandate to succeed him. After the Council Dioscorus was raised to the highest pinnacle of fame at Alexandria. He was, it was contended, the victim of a Nestorian plot at the Council; he was still living, and he and no other was their rightful "Pope." Proterius was the Emperor's bishop; he was a heretic; he had removed the name of their rightful Patriarch from the diptychs; and had intruded himself into the fold when it was bereft of its shepherd.

The Emperor Marcian having survived Pulcheria four years, died A.D. 457, and was succeeded by Leo I. (457—474), whose orthodoxy Pope Leo commended[n]. When intelligence of Marcian's death reached Egypt the hopes of the malcontent party were raised; they openly anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, and elected as their Patriarch, Timothy, to whom the nickname Ælurus (*Αἴλουρος*; *cat*) was given. An outbreak occurred at Alex-

[n] Ep. CLVI.

andria; and Proterius, who, thinking that the sacredness of the place and of the day (for it was Easter-day) would protect him, sought refuge in his Baptistery, was murdered; Timothy Ælurus was then consecrated to the Patriarchate and publicly renounced the Communion of the Alexandrian Church with Rome, Constantinople, and Antioch. In 460 Timothy was expelled by the Emperor Leo, acting under the advice of the Orthodox clergy and the Pillar-Saint, Simeon Stylites; Timothy Salophaciolus (*wearer of the white cap*) was then appointed Patriarch, and under him the Church of Alexandria enjoyed rest for sixteen years.

The Monophysites having overwhelmed the sees of Jerusalem and Alexandria, next gained possession of Antioch. Maximus dying in 455 was succeeded by Basil (456—459), after whom followed Martyrius (461—471). Peter Fuller (*γναφεύς*), a monk of the monastery of the Accœmetæ (*sleepless*) at Constantinople, gained the ear of Zeno, the son-in-law of the Emperor Leo, and accused Martyrius of Nestorianism; Martyrius abdicated the Patriarchate and found a home with Gennadius (458—471), the successor of Anatolius at Constantinople.

Juvenal dying in 458 was succeeded by Anastasius (458—478). Peter Fuller, now established in the Patriarchate of Antioch, in order to disparage the Council of Chalcedon, introduced into the Trisagion the words, *σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς* (*Who wast crucified for us*), meaning to imply that the divine Nature suffered on the Cross, whence his followers were called by the Greeks, *Theopaschites*. Peter, having been expelled by the Emperor after a synod, went back to his former monastery, and Julian (471—476) was appointed by the Orthodox party in his place.

Gennadius, Patriarch of Constantinople, was succeeded by Acacius (471—489). In 474 the Emperor Leo died. In his reign and the Patriarchate of Acacius, the XXVIIIth canon of Chalcedon was more than confirmed by the civil power, through an edict conferring on the Patriarchs of Constantinople the title of "Mother of all the Churches and of the Orthodox religion."

CHAPTER V.

The Government of the Church by Imperial Edicts.

Between A.D. 455—476 nine phantom Emperors ruled over the Western Empire; in the latter year Romulus Augustus (derisively nick-named Augustulus) yielded to the Herulian King Odoacer, and signified his resignation to the Roman Senate.

It could not be expected that the Romans would tolerate the humiliation to which the Western Emperors had subjected them. The Roman Senate resolved that one Emperor was sufficient for the whole Empire, and sent a deputation to lay the Imperial insignia before the Eastern Emperor Zeno, with the request that he would assume the sole government, with Constantinople as the capital.

The Emperor Zeno (474—476; and again 477—491), *αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Ζηνών*, as he styled himself, was a contemptible Ruler whom no one could trust; a monophysite at heart, he wavered between orthodox and monophysite views, as his supposed interests led him. An Isaurian by birth, he was disliked by the Orthodox Greeks for the double reason, that they regarded him as heterodox, and also as a barbarian. Under Leo the Popedom had become the rallying-point of Orthodoxy, and such it continued to be under Simplicius (468—483). The Romans could not have been enamoured of an Isaurian monophysite like Zeno; but they imagined that an Emperor resident at Constantinople would interfere

less in their affairs than an Emperor resident at Rome or Ravenna ; and their application to Zeno was prompted by the desire of gradually shelving the Empire altogether. The Popes would be raised to higher power than the Romans liked ; but with the contrast of their late temporal and spiritual Rulers, they would prefer of the two to be governed, temporally as well as spiritually, by their Popes.

The abeyance of the Western Empire between A.D. 476—800 added immensely to the prestige and influence of the Popes ; but the Romans were disappointed in their expectation. They exchanged an Emperor who was (at least outwardly) Catholic for a King who was professedly Arian, who had his residence at Ravenna; and when the Arian Theodoric (*the Great*), after the murder of Odoacer, assumed the government of Italy, although he allowed the Catholics the free exercise of their religion, yet, like Constantine and his successors, he exercised the right of confirming, and even of appointing and deposing, the Popes.

In 476 Zeno was deposed by Basiliscus, brother of the widowed Empress Verina, who then became Emperor. With the view to getting the monophysites to his side, Basiliscus issued an Encyclical Letter in condemnation of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, on subscribing which Peter Fuller was restored to Antioch. The gentle and universally beloved Salophaciolus was deposed, and Timothy Ælurus restored to Alexandria. On the Patriarch Acacius refusing to subscribe the Encyclical, Basiliscus deprived the Patriarchate of Constantinople of the prerogative conferred on it at Chalcedon ; but on being reconciled to Acacius he restored it. This gave occasion to Timothy Ælurus to hold, in 476, a mono-

physite synod at Ephesus, which declared the privilege given at Chalcedon invalid [a].

In 477 the Patriarch Acacius effected a popular rising, in which Basiliscus was deposed and Zeno restored. The Orthodox party was now in the ascendant, and the Stylite Daniel descended from his pillar to defend the cause of Orthodoxy against Basiliscus. In the same year Timothy Ælurus died, and Peter Fuller was again deposed. Salophaciolus was now restored, and the Church of Alexandria enjoyed rest till his death in 482.

John Thalaia was then appointed by the Orthodox party to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, the monophysites electing Peter Mongus (*stammerer*), who had been Ælurus' Archdeacon, and had the support of Zeno. But Thalaia had offended both the Emperor and Acacius, the latter of whom now sided with the monophysites, and persuaded Zeno, as the means of restoring peace, to sanction the election of Mongus ; but Pope Simplicius, whom Acacius tried to enlist on his side, refused to recognise the heretic Mongus.

Expelled from Alexandria, Thalaia went to Rome, where he found a supporter in Felix III. (483—492), the successor of Simplicius, who wrote to Zeno in his favour, and complained that Mongus had added to the Creed the words, *Who was crucified for us.* Eventually Thalaia, finding his chance of the Patriarchate hopeless, accepted from Pope Gelasius I. (492—496) the bishopric of Nola in Campania. With Thalaia the Orthodox succession of Alexandrian bishops ceased for nearly 60 years.

Zeno inaugurated the system of governing the Church

[a] Evag. III. 5, 6.

by Imperial Edicts. In 482, by the advice and probably in the very words, of Acacius, he, with a view to uniting Orthodox and Monophysites, issued an *Henoticon* to the Church of Alexandria. It anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, and approved the faith of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus, but without including Chalcedon. It declared Mary to be the Mother of God, and the Son to be Homo-ousios with the Father as touching the Godhead, Homo-ousios with us as touching the Manhood. It anathematized all those by whom the Natures are "divided, confused, or reduced to a phantom;" it censured all other doctrines, if any such have been taught "either at Chalcedon or any other council whatever," (*ἢ ἐν Χαλκήδονι ἢ ἐν οἵᾳ δήποτε συνόδῳ*).

Peter Fuller, on subscribing the Henoticon, was reinstated at Antioch, and Peter Mongus was confirmed in the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Peter Mongus anathematized the Council of Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, and deprived and banished those who refused to do the same. But the extreme monophysites were disgusted with the double dealing of their unprincipled Patriarch, who, though he disowned Chalcedon and the Tome, yet accepted the Henoticon, so they removed his name from the Diptychs, and withdrawing themselves, formed a separate schism under the name of Acephali, i.e. *those who acknowledge no bishop or head.* So that Alexandria was now divided into three sections, the Orthodox, who acknowledged Thalaia, the party of Peter Mongus, and the Acephali.

The Henoticon, although it was accepted as a compromise by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, and found many adherents in the East, failed to satisfy any party; the Orthodox especially

resented its ambiguous language with respect to the Council of Chalcedon, and the Emperor's taking upon himself to dictate to the Church on spiritual matters, whilst they suspected Acacius of a leaning towards monophysitism.

At Rome, which was now practically independent of Constantinople, the Henoticon was never accepted ; Pope Simplicius wrote to Acacius signifying his disapproval of his communicating with Mongus. Shortly afterwards Simplicius died, and Felix III. anathematized the bishops who had subscribed the Henoticon. We now witness the deep degradation to which the Eastern Church had fallen ; Felix took the unprecedented step of summoning the head of the Greek Church to Rome ; and on his not obeying the summons, he, at a Roman council in July, 484, excommunicated him. In August Acacius issued a counter-sentence of excommunication against Felix. Thus, by Zeno's Henoticon was created a schism which lasted thirty-five years (484—518).

Peter Fuller dying in 488 was succeeded by Palladius (488—498), an adherent of Peter Mongus. Acacius died in 489, and was succeeded by Favritta, who, dying a few months afterwards, was succeeded by Euphemius (489—496). Peter Mongus died in 490, and was succeeded by Athanasius (490—497), a monophysite.

Zeno, having in 489 suppressed the famous school of Edessa, the stronghold of the Nestorians, died in 491, and was succeeded by Anastasius I. (491—518). Zeno's plan of governing the Church by edicts had proved a signal failure, and at his death it appeared as if the whole Eastern Church would be swallowed up in the gulf of monophysitism.

The Emperor Anastasius was a monophysite of the

extreme type of the Acephali. He owed his succession to his marriage with Zeno's widow Ariadne; desiring a comprehension of all parties, he tried to bind the bishops by Zeno's Henoticon; but being a monophysite, his plan was regarded with suspicion by the Orthodox.

The schism between the Churches of Constantinople and Rome continued. The Patriarch Euphemius, who was orthodox, and anathematized Peter Mongus for his opposition to Chalcedon, sent the usual synodal Letter announcing his election to Pope Felix; Felix refused to acknowledge or communicate with him unless he removed from the Diptychs the names of his two predecessors, Favritta and Acacius.

Pope Felix was succeeded by Gelasius I. (492—496), a Pope, who put forth the highest pretensions for the Roman see. Euphemius twice wrote to him expressing a desire for the union of the Churches, but stating at the same time that the Church of Constantinople would never consent to the removal of Acacius' name from the Diptychs; for that he had only communicated with Peter Mongus after the latter had publicly renounced his heresy. Gelasius in his reply refused all terms short of unconditional surrender; Euphemius had adverted to Gelasius' neglect in announcing to him his succession; the Pope spoke of the custom of Roman prelates announcing their election to inferior bishops as a condescension. Gelasius also made one of those slips which were now becoming common at Rome, of basing the pretensions of the Popes on the canons of the Church (meaning the canons of Nicæa); whereas there was only, the doubtful one of an inferior council, that of Sardica, which could possibly be construed into such a meaning. He also demanded the erasure of Acacius' name, with the result

that his own name was erased from the Diptychs of the Orthodox Churches. All further negotiation was frustrated by his death.

The Patriarch Euphemius, notwithstanding the entreaty of the Empress Ariadne, had refused to crown the Emperor, until the latter bound himself to respect the Council of Chalcedon and the Orthodox faith. Chafing under this restriction Anastasius sought for an opportunity to depose him, which unfortunately presented itself through the imprudent action of the Patriarch in a secular matter; and his deposition by the Emperor was confirmed, and his excommunication pronounced, by an obsequious synod at Constantinople in 496.

His successor, Macedonius II., being the nephew of the former Patriarch Gelasius, the Emperor was aware that his election, which was supported by the Empress, would be popular, but his orthodoxy rendered him little more acceptable than his predecessor to the Emperor. Severus (of whom we shall hear more presently), one of the Acephali, was at the time in Constantinople, and in favour with the Emperor. In vain the Emperor tried to induce the Patriarch to absolve him from his promise to Euphemius, and to condemn the Council of Chalcedon; and even went the length of stirring up the Eutychian monks and the disaffected clergy to outrage and insult him. The people of Constantinople, who were well affected towards the Council, stood by their Patriarch; riots broke out at Constantinople; the statues of the Emperor were thrown down; himself in danger of his life lay for three days concealed in a suburb; he then implored the kindly offices of the Patriarch, who openly charged him with being the cause of the calamities which were besetting the Church.

Still the unequal contest between an Emperor and a Patriarch continued. The Emperor was urged on by Severus, and Julian, bishop of Halicarnassus, the leaders of the monophysites; false charges of immorality and Nestorianism were brought against the Patriarch; and in 511 he, like his predecessor, was deposed, and banished to Gangra, where he died shortly afterwards.

The day after the deposition of Macedonius, Timothy (511—517), a man of bad character and, as far as he had any convictions at all, a monophysite, was appointed to succeed him. Timothy subscribed the Henoticon, anathematized Chalcedon, and was a violent persecutor of the Orthodox; and in the year after his appointment added the words *who was crucified for us* to the Trisagion in the churches of his Patriarchate.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople was now in the hands of a monophysite. John II. (517—520), surnamed of Cappadocia, the successor of Timothy, was a monophysite. Alexandria was the hot-bed of monophysitism. Athanasius II. (490—497), the successor of Peter Mongus, was a monophysite; as were also his successors, John I. (497—507), John II. (507—517), Dioscorus II. (517—520), Timothy III. (520—536). Palladius, the successor of Peter Fuller at Antioch, was a monophysite. His successor, Flavian II., was orthodox; but he was, at the instigation of Xenaias (Philoxenus), the monophysite bishop of Hierapolis, deposed in 512 at the Synod of Sidon; when Severus, the friend of Xenaias, was intruded into the Patriarchate of Antioch (512—519).

Juvenal, as before stated, was able to recover the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. But no one, orthodox or monophysite, could place confidence in the time-serving prelate, and a cloud hung over him till his death. Of

Anastasius little is known, but throughout his Patriarchate the monophysite schism at Jerusalem was continued by the Archimandrite Gerontius, who gave great trouble by his factious endeavours to uproot the Council of Chalcedon ; but it was at length healed under Martyrius (478—486), the friend of St. Euthymius and successor of Anastasius ; and Gerontius was expelled from his monastery.

Sallustius (486—494), the successor of Martyrius, and the friend and patron of St. Sabas (439—531), the founder of the monastery which bears his name, was inclined to Orthodoxy ; but his orthodoxy was at best questionable ; he (as was supposed in the cause of peace) accepted the Henoticon, and communicated with Athanasius II., the monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria. Dying in 494, he was succeeded by the wavering Elias, who eventually, influenced by St. Sabas to refuse to repudiate Chalcedon, was in 513 deposed and banished by Anastasius. John III. was then, on consenting to anathematize the Council of Chalcedon, intruded into the Patriarchate.

The intolerance of Anastasius and his cruel persecution of the Orthodox excited the indignation of Theodoric, the Arian but tolerant King of Italy ; in 514 his General Vitalian appeared at the head of an army of Huns and Bulgarians before the walls of Constantinople, and the Emperor was forced to sign a treaty guaranteeing justice to the Orthodox Church.

As the result of the Imperial edicts Eutychianism was triumphant throughout the whole of Eastern Christendom ; but the stern justice of Theodoric had its effect. John of Jerusalem, being reclaimed to Orthodoxy by St. Sabas, was thrown into prison ; but, owing to the troubles which beset the closing years of Anastasius' reign, he was re-

leased, and continued to hold the Patriarchate till his death in 524.

Anastasius was succeeded by Justin I. (518—527), an illiterate Dacian peasant, sixty years of age, who had risen to the highest rank in the army, and now availed himself of the services of his more capable nephew Justinian. The Emperor was not only a man of inflexible orthodoxy, but no doubt had gained experience from the lesson taught to his predecessor by Vitalian. On the accession of Justin the Patriarch John II. veered round to orthodoxy, and accepted the Council of Chalcedon, which he had before anathematized. Severus, Julian of Halicarnassus, and the other monophysite leaders, being banished took refuge in Alexandria, which continued to be the hot-bed of every shade of monophysitism, and which was a too distant and too formidable a stronghold to be interfered with. Xenaias was banished first to Philippopolis and then to Gangra, where he was supposed to have been put to death.

The most noteworthy event of Justin's reign was the termination of the schism between Rome and Constantinople. The persecution of the Greek Church by the late Emperors; the Eutychianism of so many of the Eastern Patriarchs; the unflinching orthodoxy of the Popes, had immensely added to the prestige of the Roman see, and were amongst the causes of the ascendency gained by Rome over Constantinople. Persecuted, deposed, and banished in the East, simply for their adherence to Orthodoxy and the Council of Chalcedon, many prelates sought the protection of the bishops of Rome; and but for the arrogant demand of the Popes for the erasure of Acacius' name from the Diptychs, there is little doubt that, attached though Greeks are to the Orthodox Church,

there would have been an extensive secession to the Roman Church.

Anastasius II. (496—498), the successor of Gelasius, committed a mortal offence in the eyes of Romans, by sending two bishops to Constantinople, proposing that, as the means of healing the schism, the name of Acacius should be left on the Dyptichs. But his Pontificate was of short duration; the idea was scouted at Rome, and animosity which pursued him through life did not cease with his death, Dante[b] describing his suffering in Hell the torments of one who had deviated from the right path.

The schism now became one of the principal topics of conversation at Rome, where it created another schism attended with violence and bloodshed. On the death of Anastasius there was a double election to the Papacy: Laurence being chosen by the moderate party, who favoured the conciliatory policy of Anastasius, Symmachus by the irreconcilables. The matter was, at the request of the two disputants, referred to Theodoric, who decided in favour of Symmachus; and Symmachus remained Pope (498—514), Laurence being appointed to the bishopric of Nocera. The distance of Rome from Constantinople generally ensured immunity to the Popes from the Eastern Emperors; but now the Popes had a King nearer home, at Ravenna; Symmachus was accused of various crimes, one being immorality; and at the request of the clergy Theodoric deputed Peter, bishop of Altino, to investigate the charges. By order of the King, Peter took possession of the temporalities as well as the spiritualities of the Church; and although

[b] Infer. 11.

at the Synodus Palmaris of 502, which met by order of the King, Symmachus was acquitted, nothing shows more plainly the rights which the secular power claimed and exercised over the Popes, and in which the clergy acquiesced.

The Emperor Anastasius had favoured the cause of Laurence; between the late Emperor and Pope, therefore, there was little affection; each accused the other of Manichæism, which at the time was synonymous with heresy in general; and under two such opponents attempts to heal the schism were doomed to failure.

Pope Symmachus was succeeded by Hormisdas (514—523), with whom the Emperor Anastasius, when hard pressed by Vitalian, was desirous to come to terms. But the Pope required such concessions to his supremacy that the Emperor broke off all negotiations, contrasting the haughtiness of the Pope with the forgiving spirit of Christ.

Justin entered on fresh negotiations with Hormisdas; and in March, 519, a reconciliation was affected at Constantinople, but only by the Patriarch John abandoning all that his predecessors had contended for, and consenting to the removal from the Diptychs not only of Acacius, but of the Patriarchs Favritta, Euphemius, Macedonius II. and Timothy. Thus the schism came to an end, and Hormisdas lauded Justin as a second Hezekiah. As a counterpoise John obtained from the civil ruler the title of Œcumenical Patriarchs for the Prelates of Constantinople; but by the Emperor's concession to the Pope an unfortunate precedent was set, and the thin end of the wedge inserted for the Pope's after-claims of superiority.

Justin, in his zeal for Orthodoxy, issued in 523 an edict ordering all Manichæans (i.e. all dissenters from Ortho-

doxy generally) to leave the Empire under pain of death, an exception being made in the case of Goths and other foreign soldiers (*federati milites*) who were serving in the Roman armies.

Epiphanius (520—535), the successor of John II., was at the time Patriarch of Constantinople, and the abettor of the Emperor in his intolerant measures. Pope Hormisdas was succeeded by John I. (523—526). Theodoric, the Arian King of Italy, expected Justin to be as tolerant towards Arians as he himself was towards the Orthodox. In 524 he despatched the Pope on a mission to Constantinople, to demand the revocation of the late edict, and the restitution to the Arians of their churches, which had been surrendered to the Orthodox. The Pope was received at Constantinople with great honour, the Patriarch Epiphanius yielding him precedence in his Cathedral on Easter-day[c]. Whether on account of the honour accorded him, or because he failed in obtaining terms for the Arians, is unknown; but in some manner he displeased Theodoric, and on his return to Italy was thrown into prison at Ravenna, where he died shortly afterwards, to be venerated by succeeding generations as Saint and Martyr.

On the expulsion of Severus from Antioch, Paul II., a presbyter of Constantinople, was appointed Patriarch (519—521). By his rigorous enforcement of the Council of Chalcedon, Paul encountered the hostility of the Antiochenes, and found his position so intolerable that Justin accepted his resignation, and Euphrasius (521—526) was appointed.

[c] Le Quien, Vol. I. 68, says that Epiphanius claimed the first place of honour; but that when the Pope "nullum cum eo congressum habere voluit nisi primus ipse sederet," the Patriarch was "sapientior factus," and yielded.

In the latter year Antioch was nearly entirely destroyed by a series of earthquakes, in one of which the Patriarch lost his life. The Emperor sent to Antioch Count Ephraim, who held a high position in his service. Ephraim ordered the people to insert on the walls of their houses the words *Χριστὸς μεθ' ἡμῶν*; the wrath of God being appeased, and the earthquakes ceasing, the grateful citizens unanimously elected Ephraim as Patriarch (527—545); and Antioch thenceforward, in memory of the miracle, assumed the title of Theopolis (*City of God*).

Justin dying in 527, Justinian I. (*the Great*), who had lately been associated with him in the Empire, became sole Emperor (527—565). Justinian, who through the greater part of his reign was orthodox, married, in 526, Theodora, a former actress, a monophysite under the influence of Severus the deposed Patriarch of Antioch; and till her death in 548 she exercised a paramount influence over her husband. Through her influence Anthimus, the monophysite bishop of Trebizond, whose views were unknown to Justinian, was translated to the see of Constantinople, in succession to Epiphanius.

In February, 536, Pope Agapetus (535—536), attended by his Archdeacon Vigilius, arrived at Constantinople, on a political mission from Theodatus the Arian King of Italy. On the Pope's refusal to hold communion with Anthimus, a violent altercation took place between him and the Emperor; but when Anthimus was convicted before the Emperor of monophysitism he was excommunicated and deposed, and Mennas (536—552), consecrated by the Pope. In April of the same year the Pope died at Constantinople; and in a synod in May and June, convened by Justinian and atttended by representatives of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, and five

Italian bishops who had accompanied Agapetus to Constantinople, under the presidency of Mennas, sentence of deprivation of all his goods was pronounced on Anthimus.

In the same synod Severus, Peter of Apamea, and an excommunicated monophysite monk named Zoaras (all of whom were living at Constantinople under the patronage of the Empress), were anathematized. At the synod Mennas publicly claimed for the Patriarch of Constantinople the title of Œcumenical Patriarch.

Pope Agapetus was succeeded by Silverius (June, 536—March, 537), a son of the former Pope Hormisdas, appointed, as was supposed, by order of King Theodatus. When Justinian's General Belisarius arrived in 536 before Rome in triumph, the gates were, at the instigation of Simplicius, thrown open by the grateful citizens, who had never acquiesced in their subjection to their Arian conquerors, and now welcomed the Eastern Emperor as their deliverer.

The taking of Rome by Belisarius seemed to the Empress Theodora to afford an opportunity for re-instating Anthimus, and establishing monophysitism. By a bribe of sucession to the Papacy she had, when Vigilius was in Constantinople, brought him over to her views, he promising on his part, on becoming Pope, to abjure the Council of Chalcedon. The difficulty was how to get rid of the orthodox Silverius. Theodora had a confidante in Antonina, the wife of Belisarius, who ruled her husband much in the same way that she ruled Justinian ; through his wife, Belisarius was induced to depose and banish his benefactor, Silverius, and Vigilius, on payment of 200 pounds in gold, was intruded into the see (537—555). When the Emperor learnt how he had been outwitted,

he ordered the return of Simplicius, who, however, was intercepted, and by order of Belisarius given up to Vigilius; and being banished to Palmaria, an island in the Tuscan Sea, died there, but by what means was never ascertained, in the following year. Whether Vigilius was ever a rightful Pope, is more than doubtful; he was consecrated to a see which he had obtained by bribery and which was not canonically vacant; at any rate so long as Silverius lived, he was an Anti-Pope.

In fulfilment of his promise to Theodora, Vigilius, soon after his consecration, wrote to the monophysite bishops Anthimus, Theodosius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Severus, expressing his agreement with them, condemning the Tome of Leo, and anathematizing Diodore of Tarsus, the real father of Nestorianism, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret. In 540 he wrote to Justinian and Mennas, accepting the Tome and the Council of Chalcedon, and anathematizing the three monophysite bishops, and the favourers of monophysitism.

There had been for some time resident in Constantinople two monks of Palestine, Theodore Ascidas and Domitian, who with monophysite combined Origenist views. In consequence of an Origenist controversy which had lately broken out in the Lavra of St. Sabas, St. Sabas himself, at the time over 90 years of age, went, in 531, at the request of Peter, Patriarch of Jerusalem, (524—544), to Constantinople, to induce Justinian to expel the two Origenist monks. Justinian received him with the greatest reverence, asked his blessing, and promised to grant all he desired; but St. Sabas dying at the end of the same year, the two monks continued to live on at Constantinople, where they gained such an influence over the Emperor, that in 537 Theodore was,

in succession to the monophysite Sotericus, appointed Archbishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, and Domitian bishop of Ancyra; both continuing to reside at Constantinople. Under their influence the number of Origenists so greatly increased, that the future Pope, Pelagius I., who had lately been on a mission to Palestine, and was at the time Apocrisiarius at Constantinople, at the request of the Patriarch Peter, prevailed on Justinian, who was always ready to pose as a theologian, to condemn Origenism, and to require the Eastern Patriarchs to convene synods for the same purpose. In 543 the works of Origen were condemned in a synod at Antioch under the Patriarch Ephraim, and in another at Alexandria under Zoilus (542—551); whilst a synod of bishops resident at Constantinople (*σύνοδος ἐνδημοῦσα*), under Mennas, issued fifteen anathemas, which were subscribed by Theodore and Domitian, against Origen and his teaching. Theodore, however, still continued to favour the Origenists, who, through his influence, became dominant in Palestine, so that on the death of Peter, Macarius an Origenist was appointed to succeed him; but the appointment not being confirmed by the Emperor, Macarius was deposed, and Eustochius (544—556), who held an office in the church at Alexandria, but happened to be resident in Constantinople, was appointed.

In order to divert the attention of the Emperor from their own dogma, Theodore, in concert with Domitian, stirred up the controversy of the Three Chapters (*τρία κεφάλαια*), by which were meant the writings of three deceased bishops, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and the Letter of Ibas to Maris. The most important ecclesiastical events in the reign of Justinian were, the Controversy of the Three Chapters—which was

said to have filled more volumes than it deserved lines,—the Origenist Controversy which led to it, and the Fifth Œcumenical Council.

Theodore Ascidas, himself a monophysite, knew that it was the desire of Justinian to reconcile to the Church the Acephali of Egypt, which, as the chief granary of the Empire, was a country of great importance. He persuaded the Emperor that the monophysites in general were not opposed to the Council of Chalcedon itself, but to the Three Chapters, which they considered of a Nestorian character, but which had been approved of at that Council; and that if the Council could be cleared of having defended them, the monophysites might be won over to Orthodoxy.

Justinian was thus induced to issue (probably in 544) an edict condemning the Three Chapters, which he called on the Patriarchs to sign on pain of deposition. The objections to the condemnation of the Chapters were three in number:—(1) that two of the writers had been acquitted at Chalcedon; (2) that it was wrong to condemn the dead; (3) that it was a concession to the monophysites, to whom the writers were opposed.

Mennas subscribed reluctantly; and, mindful of the long schism between Rome and Constantinople which had recently been healed, on condition that if it was not approved at Rome, his signature would be withdrawn. Zoilus of Alexandria, Ephraim of Antioch, and Eustochius of Jerusalem subscribed in order to escape deposition, and the majority of Eastern bishops followed their example. But not so the bishops of the West, nor Pope Vigilius, who regarded the edict as a direct attack on the Council of Chalcedon.

Vigilius, refusing his assent to the edict, was sum-

moned by Justinian to Constantinople, where he arrived on January 25, 547. He suddenly changed his mind, and in June, 548, issued a document addressed to Mennas, entitled *Judicatum*, of which all that is known is that he anathematized the Three Chapters, saving the authority of the Council of Chalcedon. In the same month the Empress died. The Judicatum provoking serious opposition, and the bishops of Northern Africa, under Reparatus of Carthage, in 550 excommunicating him, Vigilius withdrew it, throwing the blame on the late Empress; and urged Justinian to summon a council of Eastern and Western bishops to Constantinople.

In 551 Justinian issued a second edict (ὁμολογία πίστεως) against the Three Chapters, but this Vigilius firmly refused to subscribe. Zoilus, who alone of the Eastern Patriarchs stood by him, was deposed, Apollinarius being appointed in his place. Vigilius finding himself beset with difficulties, took refuge first in the Church of St. Sergius, and in December, 551, in that of St. Euphemia in Chalcedon, where he remained nearly a year, returning, under the safe conduct of the Emperor, in December, 552. In 552 Reparatus of Carthage, who had so boldly defended the Three Chapters in the Council of 550, was deposed and banished.

Mennas having died in the previous August was succeeded by Eutychius (552—565; 577—582). Justinian sorely perplexed, following, he said, the example of his orthodox predecessors, Constantine who assembled the 318 Fathers at Nicæa, Theodosius the 150 at Constantinople, Theodosius the Younger at Ephesus, Marcian at Chalcedon, now determined to call an Œcumenical Council. The second Council of Constantinople, under the presidency of Eutychius, was accordingly opened

in the Cathedral on May 5, 553, and was attended by Apollinarius of Alexandria, Domnus III. (545—559), the successor of Ephraim at Antioch, and 165 Eastern bishops; Eustochius of Jerusalem being represented by three legates. There were eight sessions, the last on June 2.

Vigilius, having the support of about 20 Western bishops, now took courage, and, though three times invited by a deputation of the Patriarchs and 20 Metropolitans, refused to attend a Council of Eastern bishops whom he considered prejudiced on the points in dispute. On May 14 he sent to the Emperor a lengthy document signed by 16 bishops, entitled *Constitutum*, in which he refused to condemn the writers of the Three Chapters, on the ground that it was unlawful to anathematize the dead; ("nulli licere noviter aliquid de mortuorum judicare personis"). On May 26 Justinian sent to the seventh session various writings of Vigilius, with a complaint that, though Vigilius had frequently condemned the Three Chapters, he refused to attend the Council; he ordered it to continue its sessions, without regard to the Pope, and that his name should be removed from the Diptychs.

After the Council had professed its agreement with the four holy Synods, the Nicene, the Constantinopolitan, the first of Ephesus, and that of Chalcedon, sentence was pronounced in the 8th session, in accordance with the will of the Emperor, condemning and anathematizing both the writings and person of Theodore, and the writings, but not the persons, of Theodoret and Ibas; viz. those which the former wrote against the Twelve Chapters of the holy Cyril, and those which he wrote in defence of Nestorius and Theodore, and against the first Synod of Ephesus; and the letter said to have been written

by Ibas. If any one should deliver or teach or write anything against this decision, if he be a bishop or a cleric, he was to be deposed and deprived, if a monk or layman, to be anathematized.

The Pope once more turned round and stultified his *Constitutum;* under fear of banishment he confirmed the decrees of the Council; and he is supposed (although doubts are entertained of the genuineness of the Epistle) to have written that no one ought to be ashamed to retract, adducing the example of Peter. He was then, after an absence of seven years, allowed by Justinian to return to Rome, but died on the road at Syracuse.

Pelagius, the Roman Apocrisiarius, although he had subscribed the *Constitutum* of Vigilius in favour of the Three Chapters, now anathematized them, and confirmed the faith of the Fifth Œcumenical Council; he thus gained the favour of Justinian and was allowed to return to Rome, where he succeeded Vigilius as Pelagius I. (555—560). But many of the Roman clergy withdrew from his Communion, and only two bishops (with a presbyter, instead of the bishop, of Ostia) could be found to consecrate him. In the West, where the Three Chapters were vigorously defended, a serious schism arose; at Milan, Istria, Venetia, and Illyricum, the bishops separated from Communion with the Pope; nor was the Council considered Œcumenical till the time of St. Gregory the Great, who ranked it with the Œcumenical Councils; "quintam quoque synodum pariter veneror [d]."

In the last years of his life Justinian fell into the worst form of the monophysite heresy, and in 563 issued an edict establishing the aphthardocetic doctrine, which he

[d] Ep. XXV.

ordered the Patriarchs to sign under pain of deposition. In vain the Patriarch Eutychius disproved it from Scripture; whilst in the act of celebrating Mass he was arrested by a band of soldiers and deposed; John III. (*Scholasticus*), a man more eminent as a lawyer than a divine, being intruded into the Patriarchate (565—577). Anastasius, the holy and learned Patriarch of Antioch (561—593), called from his having been a monk on Mount Sinai, Sinaita, boldly opposed the edict. To the monks of Syria who sought his counsel he wrote, that "our Blessed Saviour's Body was absolutely liable to corruption; that this was the opinion of the holy Fathers as well as of the Apostles themselves; he exhorted them with the utmost earnestness to undergo all extremities, rather than suffer a doctrine so well grounded to be wrested from them." Further persecution of the Orthodox was stayed by the death of Justinian, at the very time that he was dictating the banishment of Anastasius [e].

Justinian was the founder of the style of architecture called, from the city on which Constantinople was built, Byzantine, the distinctive features of which are the Greek Cross and the cupola, which Justinian, being Emperor of the West as well as of the East, introduced into Italy. The Greeks with their usual conservatism have always adhered to their Byzantine model; but in the West, Church architecture was progressive, under the different features of Byzantine, Romanesque, Norman, and Gothic. The Romanesque was really only a Roman development of the Byzantine, and Gothic architecture grew out of the Romanesque; so that the Western is indebted to the Eastern Church for its architecture.

[e] Evag. H.E. IV. 41.

The legislation of which Justinian was author is comprised in three books, the Code published in 529, the Pandects in 533, and the Institutes about the same time, whilst after his death were published the Novels.

He adorned Constantinople and other cities in his dominions with stately churches and monasteries, and other magnificent edifices, from money extorted by oppression and impoverishing taxation of the people. The Church of Edessa, supposed to have been the oldest Christian Church in the world, having been destroyed by an inundation, he rebuilt with such splendour that the Arabians regarded it as one of the four wonders of the world. Most magnificent of all was St. Sophia's at Constantinople. The original church, built by Constantius, the son of Constantine the Great, having been destroyed by fire; and its successor in the insurrection known as the Nika, in January, 532; Justinian erected on its site a church more magnificent than any in existence. It was commenced in February, 532, and consecrated in December, 537; built at a cost equivalent to thirteen millions of our money; so that Justinian exclaimed with pardonable pride *νενίκηκα σὲ Σολομών* (*I have conquered thee, O Solomon*). This church having, before twenty years, been partially destroyed by an earthquake, was restored and underwent a second consecration in December, 561, mainly as it stands in the present day; the model of every subsequent stage of Byzantine art.

This is the Church that the Christian nations of Europe have allowed for 450 years to be in the hands of Infidels.

Justinian was succeeded by his nephew, Justin II. (565—578), who issued an edict carrying out that of his uncle; he sent into banishment Anastasius Sinaita, appointing

in his place Gregory, a man who is described as a singularly holy man, possessing almost every excellence of mind and person.

About the middle of the sixth Century a new heresy, that of Tritheism, was brought into prominence, the author of which was John Ascunages, who taught that Christ had one Nature, but that in the Trinity there were three distinct Natures. The doctrine was further developed by another John, a famous Alexandrian philosopher, who from his industry was surnamed Philoponus. Tritheism, though an offshoot of monophysitism, was generally condemned by the monophysites, who appealed against it to the Emperor Justin; Justin then, acting on the advice of the Patriarch John Scholasticus, issued a studiously orthodox document on the Trinity[f]; and the Tritheist leaders were banished.

On the death, in 577, of John Scholasticus, Eutychius was restored to the Patriarchate of Constantinople, which he held to his death. Towards the end of his life he was engaged in a long controversy on the nature of man's body after the resurrection, with the future Pope Gregory the Great, who, from 578—585, was Apocrisiarius at Constantinople; Eutychius, the nobleness of whose character was equalled only by the nobleness of his person[g], having maintained in a pamphlet that it is impalpable, Gregory maintaining its palpability. Gregory succeeded in gaining him over to the orthodox doctrine, and the reigning Emperor Tiberius ordered the pamphlet to be burnt.

Eutychius was succeeded by John IV. (582—595) (*the Faster*). There can be no doubt that at the time with

[f] Evag. V. 4.

[g] Ibid. 13.

which we are now concerned, the Patriarchs of Constantinople were regarded as the Œcumenical Patriarchs; Justinian in several of his rescripts so called Mennas, Epiphanius, and Eutychius; the term œcumenical (*οἰκουμένη*), the Greeks understood as comprising all the dominions of the Emperor, both in the East and West; the Patriarch of Constantinople therefore claimed supremacy over the whole Christian Church [h].

John the Faster, when summoning, A.D. 598, a council "of the bishops of the whole world" to Constantinople, styled himself by the recognized title of Œcumenical Patriarch [i]. The object of the council was to inquire into a false charge of a very foul nature which had been brought against the holy Patriarch Gregory, the intruded Patriarch of Antioch. By the council, which was attended by the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, Gregory received a triumphant acquittal, and held the see of Antioch till his death, when Anastasius was restored. Pelagius II., Pope of Rome (578—590), was highly indignant at the assumption of John; which was resented still more forcibly by his successor Gregory I., the Great (590—604). Gregory wrote [j] to Sabinianus, his Apocrisiarius at Constantinople, that in almost every line of the acts of the council John styled himself Œcumenical; that he hoped God would confound his hypocrisy; he calls it *a proud and atrocius title;* and forbids him to hold Communion with him ("procedere cum eo.") He styled it to the Emperor Maurice (582—602 [k]), *a name of blasphemy*, and asked him to forbid it. To the Empress

[h] Phillimore's Internat. Law, II. 449.

[i] He would not have so summoned it, says Le Quien (I. 92), "nisi Christiani orbis primarius præsul haberi voluisset."

[j] Ep. V. 19. [k] V. 20.

Constantina he wrote[l] that the times of Anti-Christ were at hand; and that it would be to the ruin of her soul if St. Peter were thus dishonoured. He wrote letters to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch that it was an infringement of their rights and dignity, the former having been founded by St. Mark, whom Peter sent[m]; the latter also being an Apostolic see[n], like Rome, the Chair of Peter[o]. He wrote to the Patriarch John[p] against *this execrable title of pride*, comparing it to the sin of Lucifer; he said it had been offered to his predecessors by the Council of Chalcedon, but never used by them; this he repeats[q] to Marcian; and[r] to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch. Gregory's ignorance of Greek may account for this error, for there is no reason for believing that the offer was ever made; that he was not versed in the Fathers nor in Church history, we learn from his letter to Cyriacus[s], in which he confessed that he was ignorant of the notorious Arian, Eudoxius, till he was satisfied about him[t], through Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria, on the testimony of SS. Basil, Gregory, and Epiphanius.

Gregory continued the controversy with John's successor Cyriacus (596—606), with whom he forbade his representative at Constantinople to communicate[u]; but the Emperor Maurice and the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch thought the matter frivolous and of little importance, whilst Gregory's remonstrance was disregarded at Constantinople.

The opposition which he encountered in trying to enforce the Fifth General Council was a sore point with

[l] V. 22. [m] VI. 60. [n] V. 39. [o] VII. 40.
[p] V. 18. [q] V. 20. V. 43; VIII. 30.
[s] VII. 4. [t] VIII. 30. [u] VII. 33.

Gregory. As stated above he ranked the Fifth Council with the four other Œcumenical Councils, which he said he reverenced as the Four Gospels. He summoned to Rome Severus of Aquileia, the Metropolitan see of Venetia, who, like his predecessors, was a strenuous champion of the Three Chapters, to have the question tried. Severus complained to the Emperor Maurice, of the injustice of a Pope acting as judge of those who had separated from his Communion; (it appears that the Popes were not held to be infallible even by the Western Church); and the Emperor annulled the order[x]. Gregory wrote to the Suffragans of Constantius, the lately appointed Metropolitan of Milan, who had condemned the Three Chapters, to "repent of the proud superstition" in withdrawing from his Communion[y]. Whilst trying to lower that of Constantinople he tried to heighten his own office. He wrote to John of Ravenna complaining of customs at variance with those of Rome; an epistle which John characterized as "a compound of honey and venom[z]." In vain Gregory strove to bring to his views his own convert, the Lombard Queen Theodelinda, and induce her to renew Communion, which she had broken off, with Constantius of Milan, in whose jurisdiction Pavia, the Lombard capital, was situated[a].

Phocas, the murderer of Maurice, his wife (the daughter of the late Emperor Tiberius), and his family, on becoming Emperor (602—610) conferred the title (if we may credit Baronius) on Boniface III. (February—November, 607), the successor of Gregory. But if so, it was quickly recovered to Constantinople; and Le Quien allows[b] that

[x] Greg. Ep. II. 41. [y] Ibid. IV. 2, 3. [z] Ibid. III. 57.
[a] Ep. IV. 4, 38. [b] I. 88.

it continued to be borne by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, and that it was the real cause of the schism of the Greek and Roman Churches.

An important event recorded in the Patriarchate of John the Faster was the discovery at Zafed (perhaps *Jaffa*) of the seamless robe of Christ. It was conveyed by three Patriarchs, John himself, Gregory the intruded Patriarch of Antioch, and John IV. of Jerusalem (574—596), attended by a large number of bishops; and, a strict fast being observed, deposited (inclosed in the chest in which it was found), in the same chest as the true Cross in Jerusalem.

In the disgraceful reign of Phocas[c], whose undeserved encomium, composed by a flattering Exarch of Ravenna, is seen on the column in the Roman Forum, Chosroes II., under the pretence of avenging the murder of his benefactor, Maurice, commenced against the Roman Empire a disastrous war which lasted more than 20 years. Scarcely had Zacharias become, in 609, Patriarch of Jerusalem, than Amida, Edessa, and Aleppo fell in rapid succession before the Persian arms.

Phocas, being dethroned and beheaded, was succeeded by Heraclius (610—641). Cyriacus was succeeded in the Patriarchate of Constantinople by Thomas (607—610), and he by Sergius (610—638), by whom Heraclius was crowned. In the first year of the new reign Anastasius II., Patriarch of Antioch (599—Sept. 610), was murdered in a tumult of Jews, whose race Heraclius had persecuted by forbidding them to enter Jerusalem.

The Persian war continued, and for some time the

[c] Some of the epithets lavished on him by Cedrenus are;—*οἰνοβαρής, αἱμοχαρής, πρὸς γυναῖκας ἐπτοημένος, θηριώδης τὸν τρόπον, αἱρετικός.*

Persians carried all before them. In 611 Antioch, in 613 Damascus, and in 614 Jerusalem fell. The Holy Places were defiled; sacred vessels and other treasures without number, accumulated in the churches, and the True Cross, were, together with Zacharias the Patriarch (610—614; 627—633), carried away to Persia; and the massacre of 90,000 Christians was attributed to the Jews and Arabs.

Fugitives from Palestine, amongst whom was the monk Sophronius (the future Patriarch of Jerusalem), sought refuge in Egypt. John V., afterwards, from his noble acts of charity, called the Almoner (ἐλεήμων), was at the time, in succession to St. Eulogius, (Theodore Scribo, 607—609, who was murdered by Monophysites intervening), the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria (609—616). He from the ample revenues of the Alexandrian Church, and also at his own expense, supplied the refugees with the necessaries of life; ministered day and night to the sick and dying in the hospitals; and sent large sums of money to the Archimandrite Modestus, who acted as his vicar during the captivity of Zacharias, for the Christians at Jerusalem. When, in 616, Alexandria itself was taken by the Persians, the holy Patriarch was forced to fly to his native Cyprus, where he died A.D. 620, and where his Festival is still observed with peculiar solemnity on November 12.

In 619 the Persians closely besieged Chalcedon, within sight of Constantinople, and refused to accept terms of peace unless the Christians would abandon Christ and worship the Sun. So disastrous was the state of things that Heraclius thought of abandoning Constantinople and making Carthage the capital of his Empire.

By a series of brilliant campaigns between 620—628,

Heraclius turned the tide of victory, and arrested for a time the decay of the Eastern Empire; the True Cross was recovered; and, on September 14, 629, restored by the Patriarch Zacharias, the Emperor himself going on a pilgrimage for the purpose to the Holy Land. On the death of Zacharias, Modestus (633—634), succeeded him as Patriarch; he is described as "a second Bezaleel or Zerubbabel;" and under him the Churches of Calvary, the Resurrection, the Holy Cross, and the Assumption, arose from their ruins.

Scarcely had Heraclius achieved his conquest over Persia, than the Saracens commenced their attacks on the Roman Empire. The reign of Heraclius coincides with the early years of the greatest and most permanent scourge with which God has ever visited the earth. The birth of Mahomet was placed, says Gibbon, in the most degenerate and disorderly period of the Persians and Romans; Mahometanism was from the first regarded as a just and righteous judgment on the corruption and schisms of the Christian Church. A united Christendom might have nipped it in the bud, but a united Christendom no longer existed. Rome and Constantinople had long been engaged in a struggle for precedence; and whilst distance gave comparatively immunity to the former, schism and persecution so rent the Eastern Empire asunder, that whole Churches, or rather nations, revolted from it, and aided its enemies; and the Greek Church succumbed to the fearful scourge which has ever since afflicted it [d].

When Mahomet began his career (A.D. 609), the two greatest powers in the world were the Persian and Roman Empires; within a few years of his death (A.D 632), Persia

[d] Completed by the fall of Constantinople.

was entirely subdued, and Rome was shorn of its Eastern provinces.

It is not unusual to describe the religion which Mahomet founded as nothing but an imposition. But a religion which, scarcely a century after the founder's death, reigned supreme in Arabia, Syria, Persia, Egypt, the whole of Northern Africa as far as Spain (the last the only Mahometan country which has permanently reverted to Christianity), cannot be so summarily dismissed. The vital doctrine of Mahometanism was the unity of the Godhead. Whilst the Eastern Christians were being perplexed with subtle points of theology; with Creeds and Councils; as to whether there were one or two Natures, one or two Wills in Christ; questions which, if perplexing to themselves, were doubly so to barbarians; Islam (*resignation*) was preaching the simple truth, "There is One God;" and this led the way to the equally simple, but false concomitant, "Mahomet is His prophet." Mahometanism, if false, was at least an improvement on the polytheism, which it superseded, of the Arabians; and its simplicity was the secret of its success.

Mahomet taught that there is One God; the Trinity he rejected as tritheism. His professed object was to restore the monotheistic religion which was revealed to Adam, and taught by the prophets who preceded Mahomet, Abraham, Moses and Jesus. The old system had been superseded by the Gospel of Jesus, of which he spoke with reverence. He believed that Jesus was born miraculously in the flesh; he believed that He worked miracles; he believed His Resurrection and Ascension, His second Advent, His triumph over Anti-Christ, and a Millennium; but that He was the Son of God he not only denied, but he also denied that Mahometans needed

an Atonement. The fatherland of Mahometanism was Arabia.

During the month of Ramadhan (the holy month of the Arabs) Mahomet had been accustomed to retire to a cave near his native city Mecca, for prayer and meditation. There in 609, when he was in his 40th year, his revelation was made to him by the Archangel Gabriel. It was delivered to him as a whole, but communicated by him to his followers in pieces, which were put together, under his successor Abu-Bekr, by Mahomet's secretary Zeid, into a book called the Al Koran (*reading*); but as they were burnt by the third successor, Othman, who put forth a version of his own, the Koran, as we have it now, is not Mahomet's at all.

His followers Mahomet called Moslem (*professors of Islam*). He adopted the rite of Circumcision; but as the Jews, the descendants of Isaac, practised it on the 8th day, the Arabs, the descendants of Ishmael, circumcised their sons, like Ishmael, in their 13th year. Images and representations of all kinds were strictly forbidden to his followers.

In the same year in which his revelation was made to him he began his mission in Mecca. In July, 622, opposition from his own tribe, the Koreish, forced him to fly from Mecca to Medina, a city about 200 miles distant; and from that time, called the Hegira, Mahometans date the commencement of their Era; a system which was commenced under Mahomet's second successor, Omar.

The term Saracen, by which Mahomet's followers were generally known, was before his time applied to Orientals generally. The early Christian historians[e] mention the

[e] Soc. IV. 36; Soz. VI. 38; Theod. IV. 20.

conversion of Saracens under their Queen Mavia, in the reign of the Emperor Valens; we are told how their first bishop, Moses, being taken to Alexandria and refusing to be consecrated by the usurper Lucius, received consecration from the bishops exiled in the desert between Palestine and Egypt.

After remaining at Medina seven years, he attacked and took Mecca, which he re-entered as a conqueror, destroying the 360 idols of the Koreish; Mahometanism now became the religion of Arabia, and Mecca the capital of Islam.

The conquest of Arabia effected, Mahomet determined to attack the two greatest powers in the world, the Persian and Roman Empires, which he knew to be exhausted by their long wars; and in 632 the invasion of both was undertaken by the Saracens. In June of that year Mahomet died, in his 63rd year, at Medina, where he was buried.

The successors of Mahomet were called Caliphs (*succesors*), and the election of his immediate successor led to a schism. The only survivor of his family was his daughter Fatima, who was married to her cousin Ali, who by one party was looked upon as the rightful successor. Abu-Bekr, the aged father of his favourite wife Ayesha, who was eventually chosen, only survived his appointment two years. Fatima died in 633. The next Caliph, Omar (634—644), having been assassinated by a Persian fire-worshipper, was succeeded by Othman (644—655). He too was murdered in a religious tumult; and Ali, Mahomet's son-in-law, then succeeded to the Caliphate (655—660). But two rival parties arose; the Shiites, holding the divine right of Ali as Mahomet's son-in-law, and the Sonnites, holding the right of popular

election, and allowing the order of succession of the first four Caliphs, but regarding with least favour that of Ali. The religious antagonism has lasted to the present day; the Sonnite, which is considered the Orthodox party, comprising the Turks, Tartars, and Indians, branding the Shiites, to whom Persia belongs, as sectaries.

Ali, falling by the hand of an assassin, was succeeded by his son Hassan, who abdicated in favour of Moawiyah (661—680), a man twenty years his elder, on condition that at Moawiyah's death he should recover the Caliphate. Moawiyah, who was the founder of the Ommyad dynasty, so called from the family to which he belonged, removed the seat of the Caliphate from Medina to the newly-founded city of Bagdad. In contravention of his agreement he nominated as his successor his own son Yezid (680—683), who secured the dynasty to his family by murdering both the sons of Ali, Hassan and Hosein.

Having given the above short account of Mahometanism, we will now briefly relate the success that attended the early arms of the Saracens.

The war with Persia ended in 651, with the destruction of the Persian monarchy; the long dynasty of the Sassanidæ came to an end, and Persia became a Mahometan country.

The invasion of Syria commenced (as was before said) in the same year as that of Persia. In Syria Greek and Roman civilization had never taken firm root; the mass of the people still spoke their old language, and professed a religion alien to that of the Orthodox Church; they were indifferent to the cause of their rulers, whom they regarded as their enemies, in whose cause they were forced to fight, and against whom their national feelings revolted. Although one and all regarded Mahomet as

Anti-Christ, and stigmatized his followers as infidels, they were ready to welcome the Arabs as friends and deliverers.

Syria was conquered in six years. In 633 Bozra, betrayed by the Roman governor, fell; in 634 Damascus, the capital; in 635 Heliopolis and Emesa; and in 637, after a siege of a few months, Jerusalem. The holy Patriarch Sophronius refusing to treat with any one but the Caliph, a messenger was despatched to Medina, and Omar appeared in person, being met at the gates of the city by the Patriarch. Sophronius was compelled to point out the holy places and the site of the Temple; "Verily," he said, "this is the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet standing in the Holy Place." The magnificent Mosque, now to be seen on Mount Moriah, held sacred by the Moslem as the spot on which Abraham offered up Isaac, still perpetuates the name of Omar. Omar knelt in prayer on the steps of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; and thenceforward Jerusalem became almost an equal object of religious attraction to the Mahometan, as to the Christian devotee. In the same year Sophronius, having lived just long enough to see his Patriarchate overwhelmed by the infidels, ended his troubled life. In the year following the death of Sophronius Aleppo and Antioch fell, and thus fell a second Patriarchate.

The Saracens next marched on Phœnicia. Tripoli and Tyre were betrayed to them. Cæsarea surrendered without a blow. Thus Syria was conquered; and, except for a short time during the Crusades, the Holy Places have been in the hands of the infidels, Christianity being tolerated by the Saracens as an appendage to Mahometanism.

In the same year (638) the Saracens invaded Egypt. Here again the same schism existed between the Orthodox Greek colonists and the native Coptic population. The Copts preferred submission to infidels, who denied Christ, to submission to fellow Christians, who differed from them only as to the one or two Natures of our Lord. The Governor of Memphis told the Saracenic General Amrou that they desired to have no Communion with the Greeks either in this world or the next; that they abjured the Byzantine tyrant, the Council of Chalcedon, and the Melchite slaves. The Greeks fought bravely, and the siege of Alexandria lasted fourteen months; but, owing to the treachery of the Copts, Egypt like Syria fell a prey to the Saracens. Peter (641—654), a monothelite, was at the time the melchite, Benjamin the monophysite, Patriarch; Peter fled to Constantinople, leaving the monophysites in possession of the churches, which was confirmed to them by Amrou. Many churches, and amongst them St. Mark's, in which reposed the relics of the Evangelist, and the books, were burnt; the precious treasures of the learning of ancient Greece were said (but the truth of this is doubted) to have been used for heating the public baths at Alexandria. "The Jacobites," says the Alexandrian annalist, Eutychius[f], "occupied, under favour of Amrou, every church not only in Alexandria, but throughout Egypt;" and from thence they spread into the neighbouring countries of Nubia and Abyssinia.

In Africa, which had been more thoroughly brought under Roman influence than Syria and Egypt, the Saracens met with a more stubborn resistance. Their in-

[f] Patriarch of Alexandria, 933—950.

vasions commenced in 647 under the Caliph Othman, but Carthage, which held the orthodox faith, was not taken till 698, nor the whole country conquered till 709. But Carthage also, the Metropolis of Africa, fell; the country of SS. Cyprian and Augustine was lost to Christianity, and from no part of the Empire was Christianity so effectually swept away as in Africa.

Thus the Roman Empire was shorn of its Syrian, Egyptian, and African provinces, and Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were lost to their Patriarchates.

A saying attributed to Mahomet, that the Moslem army which conquered the capital of the Cæsars should be forgiven all their sins, animated the Caliph Moawiyah to proclaim a "holy war" under his son Yezid, and to besiege Constantinople. In vain the siege was undertaken and renewed in six successive years, (669—675); the Saracens, though animated by the promise of Heaven, were dismayed and terrified by the lately discovered Greek fire; and after the loss of 30,000 men, were forced to purchase peace by payment of a large ransom. If, says the late Professor Freeman, Constantinople had then fallen, before the nations of Western Europe had grown up, it would seem as if the Christian religion must have been swept away from the earth.

From the wars of Christians against infidels we must now return to that which was the real cause of the fall of the Greek Church, the contentions of Christians amongst themselves.

In the reign of Heraclius the Greek Church was troubled with the monothelite heresy, which attributed only one Will to the Saviour. It was a development, and might be thought the necessary complement of monophysitism, but that Theodore of Pharan, the origi-

nator of the heresy, held that, though our Saviour had two Natures, He had only one Will, the divine Will operating on both.

At that time George II. (620—630) was, in succession to John the Almoner, the orthodox, Benjamin being the monophysite, Patriarch of Alexandria.

The idea of the one Will had been instilled into the mind of Heraclius, during his expeditions against the Persians, by Athanasius, the monophysite Patriarch of Antioch; and the Emperor seized on it as a virtual abnegation of the Council of Chalcedon, and a means of reconciling the Orthodox and Monophysites of Egypt.

Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople (610—638), and shortly afterwards Cyrus, bishop of Phasis, in Colchis, with whom Heraclius, during one of his expeditions, had an interview in 626, were brought over to his views by the Emperor, and on the death of George, the latter was rewarded with the Patriarchate of Alexandria (630—641). A basis of agreement was formulated in a council under Cyrus at Alexandria, in 633, in which nine Articles (*κεφάλαια*) were drawn up, the seventh of which, affirming that the same will or energy produced the divine and human actions of our Lord (*μίᾳ Θεανδρικῇ ἐνεργείᾳ*; *one Theandric operation*), had the effect of bringing back to the Church all the Theodosians and many thousand monophysites.

The monothelite doctrine and the *kephalaia* of Cyrus found a strenuous opponent in Sophronius, the friend of John the Almoner, who had reasoned against the heresy with Cyrus at Alexandria and Sergius at Constantinople, and who was, in 634, consecrated to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem (634—637). Immediately after his consecration Sophronius held a synod of his clergy, which pro-

nounced against monothelitism and in favour of the two Wills, and issued a synodal letter to that effect.

Rejoiced at the success of the *kephalaia*, but alarmed at the appointment of Sophronius, Sergius sought to enlist on his side Honorius, Pope of Rome (625—638). He and Sophronius both wrote to the Pope; "cujus literis" (i.e. of Sophronius), says Le Quien, "utinam assensus esset Honorius Papa, quam Sergii Constantinopolitani[g]." Honorius wrote two letters to Sergius (both of which were ordered to be burnt by the Sixth Œcumenical Council), in which he approved of what Cyrus had done; in the first he wrote "unam voluntatem fatemur Domini nostri Jesu Christi." To this dictum of the Pope the monothelites clung, and it immensely strengthened their cause. Sophronius, being detained in Jerusalem by the invasion of the Saracens, sent Stephen, bishop of Dor, on a mission to Honorius, with his letter, and ample testimony from the Fathers in proof of the two Wills; having first bound him in the Church of the Resurrection with the most solemn oath, that he would never rest till he had obtained from the Pope a condemnation of the heresy. His appeal to Honorius was fruitless, and Sophronius was enjoined to keep silence. We have already seen that in 637 Jerusalem was taken by the Saracens, and that in the same year Sophronius died. The Patriarchate of Jerusalem was usurped by Sergius, the monothelite bishop of Joppa, who ordained monothelite bishops and presbyters, and for twenty-nine years no Orthodox Patriarch was appointed to Jerusalem. Stephen faithfully carried out

[g] Vol. II. 449. It is evident that Le Quien, who was a French Dominican living 1661—1733, believed in Honorius' guilt.

the instructions of Sophronius in upholding Orthodoxy; and repairing to Rome after the death of Honorius, at the time when the Patriarchs of the Greek Church were shorn of their authority, obtained from Pope Theodore I. (642—649) vicarial authority in Jerusalem.

In 638 Macedonius, a monothelite, was consecrated by Sergius to the Patriarchate of Antioch (638—655). So that at one and the same time all the four Eastern Patriarchs, as well as the Pope of Rome, were monothelites.

Sergius dying in 638 was succeeded by Pyrrhus (638—641; 654—655), a monophysite Archimandrite of the monastery of Chrysopolis (*Scutari*), in which he was succeeded by St. Maximus, a man of noble birth, a learned theologian, and an able opponent of monothelitism.

"Encouraged and supported" by the letters of Honorius, (writes Hefele[h], the late Roman Catholic bishop of Rottenburg, quoting the Jesuit Schneemann), Heraclius, in 638, issued an *Ecthesis*, drawn up, shortly before his death, by Sergius, and favouring his views; but prohibiting the discussion of the one or two Wills, the one or two Energies. Honorius was dead before it reached Rome, and the reigning Pope, John IV. (640—642), having in a Roman Synod protested against the Ecthesis, Heraclius wrote to him, disclaiming responsibility for it, and laying the blame upon Sergius.

In 641 Heraclius died. In the same year Pyrrhus, being expelled in a popular rising, was superseded by Paul (641—654), a monothelite, whom Pope Theodore I. excommunicated for his adhesion to the Ecthesis; Paul

[h] V. 39.

retaliating by overthrowing the Pope's altar at Constantinople, and forbidding the Roman priests to celebrate Mass.

In 648 the Emperor Constans II. (641—648) put forth a more moderate document than the Ecthesis, composed by Paul, entitled the *Type* or *Model of Faith* (τύπος τῆς πίστεως), advocating neither side, but prohibiting under heavy penalties disputes on the one or two Wills. In the year of his accession Pope Martin I. (649—653) held the important council known as the First Lateran Council, which, though not Œcumenical, was attended by about fifty Abbots and clergy from the East, and which we learn from Bede was accepted by the Anglican Church at the Synod of Hatfield, with the five previous Œcumenical Councils. Stephen of Dor, who was present, read a libellus to the council, in which he successfully pleaded the cause of the Orthodox in Jerusalem against the uncanonical proceedings of Sergius of Joppa. The result was a complete victory for Orthodoxy; the council condemned the expression, "One Theandric operation" ("Dei virilem operationem quod Graeci dicunt Theandriken"), and denounced Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Macedonius of Antioch, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, but not Honorius; together with "the most impious Ecthesis and the wicked Type."

The Pope sent to Constans a Greek translation of the Acts of the Council, signed by 105 bishops; praising his virtues (Constans had shown no virtues, and went from bad to worse), and asking him to "sanction the confession of the holy Fathers." Constans received them with the greatest indignation, and treated the opposition as an act of rebellion. Several accusations, one of treasonable transactions with the Saracens,

all of which he denied, were brought against Martin; and in 653 the aged Pope was, by the Emperor's command, seized and conveyed as a common criminal to Constantinople. There, after being dragged through the streets in chains amidst the jeers of the populace; his pallium stripped off his back; half naked and starved, he was committed, more dead than alive, to the common prison. Constans went to apprize Paul, who was lying on his deathbed, of the cruel sufferings of his brother-pontiff; Paul pleaded successfully with the Emperor to prevent his execution, but overwhelmed with grief for the occurrence, died shortly afterwards. The Pope having been kept in prison three months, was banished to Cherson, in the Crimea, where, deprived of the necessaries of life, he died the next year a Confessor.

On the death of Paul, Pyrrhus, who, having been converted for a time by St. Maximus, had reverted to monothelitism, was re-instated in the Patriarchate, but dying a few months afterwards, was succeeded by Peter (655—666), a monothelite.

Vitalian (657—672), (to whom the Anglican Church is indebted for one of its greatest Archbishops of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus), at that time Pope of Rome (657—672), has been accused of monothelitism; but his conciliatory attitude towards Peter and the monothelites affords no indication that he was at any time inclined to their heresy.

St. Maximus, refusing to accept the Type, was, on the charge of bringing about the capture of Egypt and Africa by the Saracens, arrested at Rome, and conveyed to Constantinople, whence, after a synod in 662, presided over by Peter, and at which Macedonius, the monothelite Patriarch of Antioch, was present, after brutal treatment,

with his tongue and right hand cut off, he was sent into banishment, dying the same year a Confessor for the faith.

Constans, being assassinated, was succeeded by his son Constantine IV. (Pogonatus, *bearded;* 668—685), an Orthodox Emperor. After Peter three Orthodox Patriarchs of Constantinople followed: Thomas (666—669), John (669—674), and Constantine I. (674—676); and then two monothelites, Theodore I. (676—678; 684—687), and during his interrupted episcopate George I.

The monothelite controversy continuing, the Emperor determined to call a council to Constantinople, to determine the right faith, and with a view to reconciling the Eastern and Western Churches, the Eastern Church being under monothelite influence, whereas all the Popes except Honorius had been orthodox. He wrote to Donus, Pope of Rome (676—678), inviting him to send delegates, but before the letter arrived Donus was dead. His successor, Agatho (678—682), was represented by two bishops and a deacon. The Emperor wrote to the Patriarch George, "the most blessed Archbishop and Œcumenical Patriarch" (*μαχαριωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ*), bidding him summon the Metropolitans and bishops under his jurisdiction, and to request Macarius, the Patriarch of Antioch (651—dep. 680), who was a staunch monothelite, to summon his. No mention was made of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, those cities being in the hands of the Saracens; for the same reason Macarius, like his two predecessors, Macedonius and George, was resident in Constantinople, and never visited his Patriarchate.

The Sixth Œcumenical Council, the Third of Constantinople, accordingly met in the room of the Imperial

Palace called, from its vaulted roof, Trullus, (whence it is sometimes called the First Trullan Council), and sat from November 7, 680, till September 16, 681; the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem being represented by their legates. Eighteen sessions were held. Whenever the Emperor was present, as he was at the first eleven and last sessions, he himself presided, having on his right hand the Patriarchs George and Macarius, and on his left the Papal legates.

In session I. the Papal legates attacked the Monothelite doctrine, which George and Macarius defended as being agreeable to the Œcumenical Councils; the holy approved Fathers; Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, Patriarchs of Constantinople; and Honorius, Pope of Rome.

In the three next sessions the Acts of previous Councils were read, as well as two dogmatical Epistles from Pope Agatho and a recent Roman Synod. At the Roman Synod Wilfred of York was present; in the second Epistle regret was expressed that "Theodore, the Archbishop and philosopher of Britain," was not present at the Roman Synod. Theodore was himself holding the Synod of Hatfield, which condemned the monothelite heresy.

At sessions V. and VI. Macarius presented pretended extracts from the Fathers, in favour of monothelitism, which he himself afterwards confessed to be garbled.

In session VII. the Papal legates adduced testimony in favour of two Wills and two operations. In session VIII. George declared that he was convinced by works brought forward by Agatho at his Synod; he, and with him most of the other monothelite bishops, abjured the heresy. On the petition of George, the name of Pope Vitalian, which it would appear the monothelites, finding him

less compliant than they expected, had removed, was restored to the Diptychs. In session IX. Macarius "as a new Dioscorus" was anathematized and degraded. In XI. the Synodal Letter, which Sophronius had sent to Sergius from the Synod of Jerusalem in the year of his accession, was read. In XII. the letters of Honorius to Sergius were read, (the Greek edition was afterwards compared with the Latin original and found to be correct). Session XIII. pronounced the letters of Sergius to Cyrus and of Honorius to Sergius to be heretical, "et tanquam animæ noxias;" and the Council, together with the maintainers of the one Will, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, Peter, and Theodore of Pharan, anathematized and cast out of the Church Honorius, formerly Pope of Old Rome; "quia . . . impia dogmata confirmavit." The letter of Sophronius was pronounced Orthodox, and his name ordered to be replaced on the Diptychs.

At session XIV. Theophanes, the successor of Macarius, took his seat. In session XVI., the orthodoxy of Agatho, George, and Theophanes was recognized; and the anathemas were repeated in which "the heretic Honorius" was included. In XVII. the decree of the Council was drawn up and read. In session XVIII. and last, the decree was subscribed by the Emperor, the Papal legates, and 160 bishops; the Council set its seal to the five previous Councils, repeated the Creed of the 318 and of the 150 fathers; and forbade the introduction of any novel term (*καινοφωνίαν*) into the Creed. Again the unfortunate Honorius was condemned.

It was determined that "following the five holy and Œcumenical Synods there were in the Saviour *δύο φυσικὰς Θελήσεις ἤτοι Θελήματα, καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας* (*two physical wills and two physical energies*), operating *ἀδιαι-*

ρέτως (*without division*), ἀτρέπτως (*without change*), ἀμερίστως (*without antagonism*), ἀσυγχύτως (*without confusion*);" that the Human Will could not come into collision with the Divine Will, to which it was in all things subject. And the bishops before condemned were punished with excommunication and anathemas.

Pope Agatho was succeeded by Leo II. (682—683), who confirmed the sixth Council in the same manner as the five preceding Councils. He spoke of "sancta et universalis et magna sexta synodus," and he confirmed the condemnation of Honorius. This he did in the strongest terms, in a letter to the Emperor;—"Anathematizamus novi erroris inventores—necnon et Honorium, qui hanc Apostolicam sedem non Apostolicæ traditionis doctrinâ lustravit, sed profanâ proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere conatus est."

The condemnation of Honorius cannot be passed over as by Baronius, who says that the Acts of the Council were forged, and even goes so far as to assert that Theodore, the monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, was the person anathematized; that he gained possession of the Acts, and for *Θεόδωρον* substituted *Ὀνώριον*; and that the condemnation by Leo is spurious. But can it be imagined that the Roman legates would not have heard of and exposed the forgery? The anathema pronounced by the Council and by Pope Leo, every Pope, from the eighth to the eleventh Century, repeated, as well as the Trullan and Second Nicene Councils, and the council which the Roman Church holds as the eighth Œcumenical Council; whilst the Roman Breviary, says M. Renouf, continued his condemnation till the seventeenth century [i].

[i] Quoted from Smith's Biog. Dict. III. 674.

The Emperor Constantine IV. was succeeded by his son Justinian II. (685—dep. 695 ; rest. 705—711), a boy 16 years of age, surnamed Rhinotmetus (*slit-nose*). Theodore, Patriarch of Constantinople, was succeeded by Paul III. (687—693). It cannot be imagined that Justinian II., whose character bore a marked resemblance to that of his grandfather Justin, would be much influenced by religious conviction ; but at the same time he had no intention that his own Patriarchate should be overshadowed by that of Old Rome. To give his own Patriarchate a triumph over the Western Patriarchate, and to restore the balance, which had been impaired through the condemnation by the late council of four Patriarchs of Constantinople for heresy, was his object in summoning to Constantinople, A.D. 691 or 692, the council which, as being supplemental to the Fifth and Sixth, is known as the Quinsext (πενθεκτή), and from its being held in the vaulted room, the Trullan Council. Since no canons were passed by those councils, the Trullan is regarded by the Greek Church as continuous and supplementary, and its canons to be those of the Sixth Œcumenical Council. It was presided over by the Patriarch Paul of Constantinople, and was attended by all the other Eastern Patriarchs, Peter of Alexandria, George of Antioch, and Anastasius of Jerusalem. The Roman Church was represented by legates, but apparently not commissioned by the Pope.

Of the canons, which were 102 in number, we will mention the most important. I. declares the adherence of the Council to the six Œcumenical Councils, and that the sixth Council had anathematized Honorius. II., that all the eighty-five Apostolical Canons are binding (whereas the Roman Church only holds fifty) ; but it rejected the

Apostolical Constitutions. III. forbids priests to contract second marriages. VI. and XIII. speak of the different rule between the two Churches with regard to the marriage of the clergy: "In the Roman Church those who wish to be ordained to the Diaconate must have no further intercourse with their wives. We however, in accordance with the Apostolic canons, allow them to continue in marriage. If any one seeks to dissolve such marriages he shall be deposed, and the cleric who dismisses his wife shall be excommunicated." XII. forbids bishops to continue in their married state; (this the fifth Apostolical Canon allows). XIV. enacts that presbyters should not be ordained before thirty; deacons 25; deaconesses 40; by Canon XV., subdeacons not before 20. XXXII. condemns the custom of the Armenians in not mixing water with the wine in the Eucharist. XXXVI. confirms Canon III. of the Second Œcumenical Council, and XXVIII. of the Fourth:—"We decide that the see of Constantinople shall enjoy equal rights with those of Old Rome; and shall be highly regarded in ecclesiastical matters as that is, and be second after it. After Constantinople comes the see of Alexandria, then Antioch, and next Jerusalem." XXXVIII. repeats Canon XVII. of Chalcedon, which gave the right of appeal to the Exarch of the Diocese, or to the Patriarch of Constantinople. LII.: On all days in Lent, except Saturdays, Sundays, and the Annunciation of the Virgin, the Liturgy of the Presanctified is to be used; (in Canon XLIX. of the Council of Laodicea[k] the Annunciation is not included). By XLV. the wife of a bishop must enter a monastery. LV.: "At Rome they fast every Saturday in Lent. This

[k] Perhaps c. A.D. 344.

is contrary to the sixty-sixth Apostolical Canon, and ought not to be done;" the Canon forbids fasting on any Saturday except Easter Eve. LVI. condemns the Armenian practice of eating eggs and cheese on the Sabbaths and Lord's Days in Lent, as being the produce of animals which may not be eaten at that season. LXVII. forbids the partaking of the blood of animals, which though condemned in the Acts of the Apostles was not considered in the Latin Church to be of permanent obligation. LXIX. forbids any lay person, except the Emperor, to go up to the altar, "according to ancient tradition." LXXXI. pronounces any one heretical who adds to the Trisagion the words, "Who was crucified for us." LXXXII. forbids the representation of our Saviour under the figure of a lamb, and allows it only in human form. LXXXIX., on the Great Sabbath, fasting should be continued till midnight. XC., from Vespers on Saturday till the evening of Sunday there should be no kneeling.

The Canons were signed by the Emperor, the Eastern Patriarchs, by 211 bishops, and by the Roman legates. All the canons were received in the Greek Church, and met with general acceptance at the Seventh Œcumenical Council; and Gratian reckons the Trullan Council as a continuation of the Sixth Œcumenical Council. But the Canons which were directed against the Latin Church were naturally objected to by Pope Sergius I. (687—701), who understood their meaning better than the legates, and said he would rather die than sign them.

The Emperor ordered the Pope to be seized and brought to Constantinople; but, before the order could be executed, the tyrant was himself deposed, his nose mutilated, and he was banished to Cherson. When in 705 he was re-

stored, a series of atrocities ensued, his first act being to put out the eyes of, and send into banishment, Callinicus, the Patriarch of Constantinople (693—705). Cyrus was then appointed to the Patriarchate.

Pope Sergius was succeeded by John VI. (701—705), after whom followed John VII. (705—707). He was ordered to accept the Trullan Canons, but was saved further humiliation by death. Sisinnius, having survived his election only twenty days, was succeeded by Constantine I. (708—715). The Emperor summoned him to Constantinople, and the Pope went. How far he obeyed the Emperor's order is unknown; the fact that he was a Greek may account for the honourable reception accorded him. In 711 the reign of terror came to an end, Justinian being deposed, and, together with his son Tiberius, beheaded, by the army. Thus the dynasty of Heraclius came to an end.

CHAPTER VI.

The Non-Orthodox Greek Churches.

To the Œcumenical Councils the Church is indebted for the right doctrine of the Incarnation; but their anathemas and excommunications detract much from their usefulness. The Holy Fathers who sat at the Councils believed that the truth had been revealed to them by God, to be committed to the Church; but whilst to lay down the truth and forbid any addition to the Creed was the lawful province of the Church, to cut off from the Sacraments all that rejected the watchwords of Councils was a dangerous experiment. It left to the Orthodox Greek Church a heritage of woe lasting to the present day; whilst the ultra-dogmatism and narrow-mindedness of those early days is out of harmony with modern times; and is in the present day a stumbling-block to many in joining the Catholic Church.

As the result of the Council of Ephesus Nestorianism became the religion of Syria; after Chalcedon, Monophysitism became the religion of both Syria and Egypt. Alexandria and Antioch, next to Rome the greatest cities in the world, were Greek colonies planted in a soil which was never completely Hellenized, and never willingly acquiesced in what they considered an alien yoke. National antipathy seized the opportunity offered by religious controversy, to revolt at once from the Orthodox Church and the Roman Empire. The schism which followed the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon was as much political as religious, and was not merely a revolt

of Churches from the Orthodox Church but of whole Nations from the Roman Empire.

It is difficult to determine to what extent some of those Churches were and are, if at all, heretical. It is possible to resent the condemnation of individuals and even reject the precise words of Councils, and to be led thereby into extravagant modes of thought and incautious expressions, without sympathising with the condemned doctrines. This was certainly the case with the Armenians, who, although they refused to recognize the Council of Chalcedon, never were and are not now heretical; and perhaps it was the case with others. And now that re-union is being brought prominently forward, and the difficulties which beset the fifth century have passed away, there seems to be no reason why these, at present separated, Communions should not be recovered to the Orthodox Church. Especially is this the case with the Armenians and Jacobites; if the latter abjured the Orthodox on the ground that it was a Melchite Church, they cannot, since the fall of Constantinople, make the same complaint. They are, if not heretical, at least schismatical, and in that sense we call them *Non-orthodox.* They are of two classes: those who are held to be Monophysites, and those who are held to be Dyophysites; the former, as the Nestorians, separating after the Council of Ephesus; the latter after Chalcedon, as the Jacobites, Copts, Abyssinians, and Armenians. There is also one remnant of the Monothelite heresy, the Maronites, who belong to the Roman Church. To each of these we propose to devote such short space as is consistent with a history of the Orthodox Church, which the schism has so materially affected.

(1.) *The Nestorians;* who, however, refuse to acknow-

ledge Nestorius as their founder, and object to be called after his name, calling themselves Syrians; and convenience requires that we should call them Eastern Syrians, to distinguish them from the Jacobites or Western Syrians.

The Eastern Syrians (to call them by that name) ascribe their origin to St. Thaddæus or Addæus, one of the Seventy, sent to their sacred city Edessa by the Apostle St. Thomas; and to St. Mari or Mar Mari (a disciple of Thaddæus), whom they claim for their first bishop, and who established his see at Ctesiphon, the then capital of Persia.

Edessa had been from very early times famous for its school, which rose to great eminence under St. Ephrem Syrus, who, after the fall of Nisibis under the Emperor Jovian, made Edessa his residence. At the time of the first Council of Ephesus Rabulas was bishop of Edessa (412—435); he was a follower of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and supported John of Antioch at Ephesus.

Under him the school of Edessa became a stronghold of Nestorianism. After the Council he deserted his former friends, and became a staunch supporter of Orthodoxy. He expelled the Nestorian teachers of Edessa. Ibas (435—457) his successor, one of the expelled teachers, restored the school. Barsumas, another of the expelled teachers, became Bishop of Nisibis and Metropolitan (435—489); and together with Ibas was the leading propagator of the opinions of Nestorius.

Notwithstanding that Ibas had the support of the great majority at Edessa, there was an influential minority opposed to his teaching, especially to his famous letter to Maris; and they obtained from Theodosius an order for his deposition and imprisonment. Ibas is said to have

been confined in no fewer than twenty prisons; and to one of those imprisonments is attributable his absence from, and condemnation by, the Latrocinium.

After the deposition of Nestorius, his followers, being persecuted in the Roman Empire, sought refuge in Persia, where the way had been prepared for them by Ibas' famous letter to Maris, now Bishop of Hardascir. The Persian King threw his ægis over Nestorianism, thinking thus to weaken the rival Roman Empire; and the Nestorians received protection in Persia, especially at Nisibis. Barsumas persuaded their Catholicos to separate from the Orthodox Church; and soon afterwards he and the Nestorian community abjured the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Antioch.

During the fifty-four years that he presided over the see of Nisibis, Barsumas exercised an ever-increasing influence over the Persian King; and by persuading him that the Nestorians were his friends, he induced him to expel the Orthodox from his dominions; to put the Nestorians in possession of the churches; and to give their Catholicos, who assumed the title of Patriarch, Seleucia, a town about three miles distant from Ctesiphon, as his see. When the Emperor Zeno suppressed the school of Edessa in 489 (the year of Barsumas' death), and its "Persian disciples," Barsumas founded the famous school of Nisibis, over which Narses presided with great success for fifty years; from the school proceeded the missionaries who carried Nestorian Christianity into Egypt, Syria, Arabia, India, Tartary, and China; and seemed at one time likely to convert the whole of Asia.

Before the death of Barsumas serious differences had arisen between him and the Seleucian Patriarch Babuæus, Barsumas allowing, and Babuæus forbidding,

priests and monks to marry, and each excommunicating the other. Still the Church of the Eastern Syrians, recruited by persecuted refugees from the Roman Empire, continued to flourish and to enjoy the protection of the Persian King; till A.D. 499, in a Synod at Seleucia under Babuæus, the whole of Persia broke away from the Orthodox Church.

On the foundation of Bagdad in 762, the Eastern Syrians removed their primatial see to the seat of the Caliphs, and, says Dr. Neale [a], in the ninth century they and the Jacobites outnumbered all the Greek and Roman Churches together, the Eastern Syrians being by far the greater number of the two. Their skill and learning recommended them to the Caliphs of Bagdad, who appointed them to high political offices; and their missionary zeal remained unabated till the thirteenth century, at which time their Patriarch had under him twenty-five Metropolitans, and it appeared that they would supersede the Orthodox Greek Church. But with the overthrow of the Caliphate, in 1219, by Ghengis Khan, their prosperity came to an end. In vain they attempted missionary enterprises amongst the Mongols. Timour, "the scourge of Asia," nearly annihilated them, and the survivors were driven into the inaccessible mountains and valleys of Kurdistan, where, in the village of Kochanes on the Sea of Urmi, their Patriarch took up his humble residence.

In 1552, owing to a disputed election to the Patriarchate, they became split up into two parties; the smaller, those living in the plains of Mosul, consisting of rather less than a third of the whole number, electing an Anti-Patriarch, who received consecration from Pope Julius

[a] Introduction, I. 144.

III.; and in 1778 they put themselves under the see of Rome. Thus arose the sect of Uniat Chaldæans, their Patriarchs refusing to abandon their old customs or to allow the Pope's infallibility.

The larger portion of the Eastern Syrians consist in the present day of two sections, those living in the mountains, who are under the Turkish government, and those in the plain under Persia; but both sections acknowledge Mar Shimun (*my Lord Simon*), as their Catholicos or Patriarch, living at Kochanes, is always styled.

The second in rank is the Mattran (*Metropolitan*), whose dynastic title is Mar Knanishu (*Mercy of Jesus*); the only one left of their former twenty-five Metropolitans; his Diocese is within the dominions of the Sultan; and by him their Patriarch is consecrated. They have ten bishops (some with only nominal Dioceses), seven in Turkey, and three in Persia.

In compliance with the oft-repeated requests of the Eastern Syrians, both in Turkey and Persia, made to Archbishop Howley, the S.P.G. sent over to them in 1843 Dr. Badger as a missioner; but, owing to the frightful Kurdish massacres in that year and in 1845, the mission was cut short; and notwithstanding the Sultan's promises of reform, Dr. Badger was recalled to England. We have some experience in the present day of the differences between the Sultan's promises and their performance. Mr. Layard enlightens us as to that period. He represented to the Sultan the miserable condition of a village which he visited after the massacres, and the Sultan sent officers to carry out his reforms. This is what Mr. Layard tells us he found on a second visit to the same village. A body of Turkish troops had lately

visited the village, and destroyed what little had been restored since the Kurdish invasion. "The same taxes had been paid three times over; . . . . The chief had been thrown, with his arms tied behind his back, on a heap of burning straw, and compelled to disclose where a little money which had been saved by the villagers was buried; the priest had been torn from the altar, and beaten before his congregation. Many showed me the marks of torture on their bodies. . . . . All these deeds of violence had been committed by officers sent by the Porte to protect the Christian subjects of the Sultan, whom they pretended to have released from the misrule of the Kurdish chiefs."

Since 1884 "the Assyrian Mission," sent at their request by Archbishop Benson, has been working amongst the Eastern Syrians, with the object of instructing the children in their schools, and of giving to their clergy a more perfect knowledge of the faith than they before possessed; not of proselytizing; "not," in the words of Archbishop Benson, "to change any doctrines or customs, except such as are contrary to that faith which the Holy Spirit, speaking through the Œcumenical Councils of the undivided Church, has taught as necessary to be believed by all Christians."

Owing to Mahometan opposition in Turkey, the mission has met with greater success in Persia, where its principal seat of operations is Urmi. In 1896 Mar Gabriel, the bishop of Urmi, who attended the first Lambeth Conference, was, whilst crossing into Turkish territory, with his twelve companions, foully murdered by the Sheik Saddik. It cannot be wondered that the present bishop of Urmi, Mar Yunan, in the hope of Russian protection, sought and obtained a Russian mission, which has over-shadowed, and may lead to the withdrawal of

the Anglican mission. But Turkey, which contains the large majority of Eastern Syrians, remains unvisited by Russia; and the Anglican mission, labouring under such difficulties as the murderous Sheik, the opposition of the Sultan, and the hostility of the Kurds, deserves, as no doubt it will meet with, the increased support of the Church of England.

(2.) *The Jacobites.* Jacobite is the common appellation of Monophysites, but is applicable in particular to the monophysites of Syria, who, after for a time fluctuating between Nestorianism and monophysitism, eventually, under the influence of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, settled down in the latter. When, owing to the rigorous enforcement by Justinian of the decrees of Chalcedon, monophysitism in Syria seemed on the point of extinction, there arose a monk, a former pupil of Severus, named Jacob Baradai (*the man of rags*); who having, A.D. 541, received consecration as titular bishop of Edessa from some monophysite bishops, assumed the headship of the previously acephalous party. He is said to have ordained the fabulous number of 80,000, and from him the monophysites derived the name of Jacobites.

The Jacobites claim to be next to Jerusalem the oldest Church in Christendom. That Peter was ever bishop of Rome is an historical impossibility. From Peter, as Bishop of Antioch, the Jacobites trace their succession; and since to Antioch the distinctive title of Patriarch originally belonged, as that of Pope did to Alexandria, their Patriarch, who always bears, after the martyr-bishop of Antioch, the name of Ignatius, is styled Patriarch of Antioch; having his residence at Diarbekr (*Amida*), and sometimes in the monastery of St. Ananias near Mardin [b].

[b] "In monasterio Zepharensi sive S. Ananiæ haud procul ab urbe Marde." Le Quien II. 1347.

The Jacobites are mostly to be found in the extreme north of Syria, but they have a monastery and about fifteen families at Jerusalem. Their Metropolitan, called to the present day Maphrian (*fruit-bearer*), having with him three presbyters, an archdeacon, and a number of deacons, lives in the house of St. John Mark on Mount Sion. In the five annual Lents which they observe, both the clergy and laity abstain not only from flesh and eggs, but the taste of wine, oil, and fish.

The famous Xenaias or Philoxenus (to whom the Church is indebted for the Syriac translation of the New Testament), the propagator of Jacobitism in Egypt, is still honoured as a Confessor by the Jacobites. The last of their many distinguished scholars was Abulpharagius (*Ben Hebræus*), bishop of Guba, and afterwards Maphrian; "poet, physician, historian, philosopher, and divine." Beloved not only by Christians of all denominations, but also by Mahometans and Jews, his funeral in 1286 was attended by his rival, the Nestorian Patriarch, with a train of Greeks and Armenians, "who forgot," says Gibbon, "their disputes, and mingled their tears over the grave of an enemy [c]."

(3.) *The Copts.* Till the Council of Chalcedon, the Copts, who constituted by far the greater part of the population of Egypt, were subject to the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria. The opposition in Egypt to the Council of Chalcedon was increased by the intolerance of Justinian I. and the Greek Emperors. Socially, politically, and ecclesiastically opposed to the Empire, they were led to hate and abjure everything that was Greek. The followers of the Emperor and the Orthodox Church they stigmatized as μελχῖται (*Imperialists*); "every Melchite

[c] VIII. 357.

or Imperialist was in the eyes of the Copts a stranger, every Jacobite a citizen; the alliance of marriage, offices of humanity towards the Greeks, were condemned as deadly sins; the nation renounced all intercourse with the Emperor, and his orders, at a distance from Alexandria, were obeyed only under pressure of military force [d]."

Since A.D. 536 they have chosen a Patriarch of their own, who, dwelling at Cairo, accounts himself the true successor of St. Mark. Nationally descended from the ancient Egyptians, and speaking, although in a debased form, the very language which Moses spoke at the Court of Pharaoh, they discarded in their services the Greek language, and adopted an idiom which is understood, not at all by the people, and scarcely at all by the clergy, and has to be supplemented by an Arabic translation in the margin.

But in renouncing the Orthodox Church, and with it the Greek Emperor, the Copts made a miserable bargain; between them and the Greeks there had been at least the affinity, even if in a different form, of Christianity; between them and their Mahometan masters, who treated their religion with scorn, there was nothing but antipathy; and if the Greeks chastised them with rods, the Mahometans chastised them with scorpions.

From their first to their last chapter, since their revolt from the Orthodox Church and the Greek Empire, the history of the Copts has been one of disaster. For a full account of their sufferings under the Mahometans we must refer the reader to Renaudot's History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria. Nor did they fare much better

[d] Ibid. VIII. 365.

during the French occupation of Egypt (July, 1798—September, 1801), when Napoleon I. played the Mahometan, and declared Islam to be the religion of France. The French found it necessary to employ Christians for offices of trust; this laid them open to the suspicion of the Mahometans, and at the very commencement of the occupation, a proposal of the Divan for a general massacre at Cairo was defeated by only a narrow majority. Their churches, convents, and private dwellings were searched by the Turks for arms; "in a word," says the Moslem Historian, Gabbarti, "Egypt became for the moment the theatre of robberies, assassination, and murders." Why the English, after they drove the French out of Egypt, left the Christian Copts to the mercy of the Turks must have surpassed the comprehension of Europe; scarcely had the English left the country than a violent insurrection broke out; a second insurrection two years afterwards (May, 1805), made way for Mahomet Ali.

With the accession of Mahomet a new era dawned on the Copts. He found them more intelligent, better men of business, and (a quality in which they are not thought generally to have excelled) more trustworthy than the Mahometans. But at the same time he promoted (wherever possible) Armenians, Roman Catholics, or other European Christians, fearing a preponderating influence in the National Church of the country. But the Copts were never free from danger, and an order for a general massacre of Christians had gone forth, for the very day on which the English forces entered Cairo, after Tel-el-Keber.

Two peculiarities of the Coptic Church must be mentioned: one that Orders are conferred, not by imposition of hands, but by breathing; another of less consequence,

that through various changes the chasuble has disappeared, and been practically transformed into a cope.

The Copts have twelve bishops, eight in Upper and four in Lower Egypt; and two Metropolitans, those of Alexandria and Minufiyah. Besides the Patriarch at Cairo they have also a Patriarch at Jerusalem, where they have established themselves in a monastery near the Holy Sepulchre.

In the eighteenth century the Roman Catholics organized a Uniat Church, which is said to number 10,000 adherents, with a well-trained clergy under the Jesuits, and a Coptic seminary at Cairo.

The Anglican Church will never forget the debt of gratitude which the universal Church throughout the world owes to the great Athanasius, "the Father of Orthodoxy;" and since the occupation of Egypt in 1882 it has been the endeavour of the Anglican Church, not to proselytize the Copts but, to bring them back to their Orthodox Patriarch. Whatever the Copts may have once been, they are not now monophysite. So soon as we entered on the control of Egypt, "The Association for the Furtherance of Christianity in Egypt" was formed, of which the late Archbishop of Canterbury, in June, 1883, accepted the Presidency. There is a hopeful feature in the growth of a young reforming party amongst the Copts, demanding greater efficiency in their schools, better education, and a more adequate stipend for their clergy. In 1890 the El Tewfik (*pioneer*) Society, to ameliorate the condition of the Church, was founded, nearly every intelligent Copt being enrolled in the list of its members. At the request of the Copts at Cairo in 1891, the "Association" sent out a teacher for the Iktissad School, to give such religious training as might

bring the Copts back to the primitive standard of their Church, in faith and practice.

Nubia, the intervening country between Egypt and Abyssinia, received Christianity in the fourth century. After Chalcedon it joined the Monophysites; but in the twelfth century, owing to persecution and temptations to apostatize, Nubia entirely threw off Christianity, and in the present day there are few Christians living between the Cataracts.

(4.) The Abyssinians assert that they were converted from Judaism by the Eunuch of Queen Candace; and that after his conversion by St. Philip he became the Apostle of Christianity to their country. To their being converts from Judaism is to be attributed the strange medley of Christianity and Judaism, in the doctrine and ritual of the Abyssinian or Ethiopian Church.

We stand on surer ground when we attribute its foundation to two cousins, Frumentius and Edesius, the sole remnant of a crew under their uncle Meropius, a merchant of Tyre, who, about A.D. 316, were murdered by the barbarous inhabitants of the country. The cousins "were by no means ignorant of the Greek language[e];" and their learning recommended them to the King. Edesius returned to his parents at Tyre; but Frumentius was appointed tutor to the King's sons, and in 438 consecrated Bishop of Axum, the capital of Abyssinia, by St. Athanasius, in a synod at Alexandria[f].

From the time of St. Athanasius the Abyssinians have always kept up a close connection with Alexandria; their

[e] Soc. I. 19.

[f] Ibid.; Soz. II. 24; Theod. H.E. I. 23; Ruf. H.E. I. 9; speak of the conversion of India. India was amongst the ancients an indefinite country, but in this case Ethiopia is evidently meant.

Abuna (*Father*) being always chosen and consecrated by the Coptic Patriarch, an Abyssinian being by their canons ineligible. By the sixteenth of the Arabic Canons (published under the name of Nicene) the Abuna, although he has the rank of Catholicos or Patriarch, has not the power of ordaining; and, being a foreigner, he is generally ignorant of the Ethiopic, the ecclesiastical language, as well as the language of the Court and the higher classes, which is the Amharic.

Next in rank to the Abuna is the Kumos, a sort of Archdeacon, an intermediate between a bishop and a presbyter; but since in Abyssinia there are no bishops, he has no superior except the Abuna. The clergy, except monks, of whom there are two principal classes, those of Debra-Libanos and Abba Eustateos (*St. Eustathius*) are allowed to marry.

In the early years of the seventeenth century the Jesuits, conveyed in Portuguese vessels, obtained in the country a short-lived footing, which led to a revolution; the Abuna, clergy and monks stood firm to their faith; the King, Sequed, who had acknowledged the supremacy of Pope Gregory XV., was compelled to abdicate in favour of his son Basilides; and the Jesuits were driven from the country, never to return.

Who and what the famous Prester John (supposed to have lived about A.D. 1200) was, has been and must remain a matter of conjecture. The general opinion is that he was a mighty King of Ethiopia; the explanation given by Renaudot is the simplest, and perhaps as likely as any to be right; viz., that John was both King and presbyter, of the latter of which offices Prester is a contraction.

The Abyssinians "are," says Dean Stanley, "the only

true Sabbatarians of Christendom." They keep the Jewish Saturday as well as the Christian Sunday; and dancing, as amongst the Jews, forms part of their ritual. They practise Circumcision, and believe that they possess the Ark of the Covenant. Marriage with the childless widow of a deceased brother is enjoined. The flesh of animals that do not chew the cud, and have not cloven feet, is forbidden.

The Christians of St. Thomas. One of the chief missions of the Eastern Syrians was to the coast of Malabar. Uniform tradition relates how the Apostle St. Thomas, having preached in Meliapore, near Madras, and afterwards in China, returned to the coast of Coromandel; how the chiefs were well affected to his preaching, and how he baptized the King of the country; but the success of his mission so enraged the Brahmins that he suffered martyrdom at their hands at Meliapore. The scene of his martyrdom is still known as the "Mount of St. Thomas," and his remains were translated to, and deposited in, the Church of St. Thomas at Edessa. St. Bartholomew is also believed to have preached in India. The canons of the Council of Nicæa were subscribed by a bishop styling himself "Bishop of Persia and the great India;" and in process of time the Church, which meanwhile suffered much persecution, came to be recognized as the Church of Malabar, or the Christians of St. Thomas.

In the sixth century the Nestorians won the Church over to their faith. A rich Nestorian merchant named Mar Thomas (but at what date is uncertain) confirmed them in Nestorianism, and persuaded them to receive a bishop from the Catholicos of the East. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle relates that King Alfred sent from

England missionaries to these Christians, from whom they brought home valuable presents. So powerful did they become that in the tenth century they were able to throw off the Pagan government, and assume the government themselves, under the title of "Kings of the Christians of St. Thomas." After several generations the kingdom, through failure of issue to the Christian King, came to an end, and devolved on the Pagan King of Diamper ; and afterwards on the King of Cochin.

Under that dynasty the Christians of St. Thomas were living, when, A.D. 1503, the Portuguese under Vasco di Gama arrived on the coast of Malabar. We must pass over the persecutions which they suffered from the Latins in order to force them into the Church of Rome. Ninety years of strife had won over no appreciable number to Rome, when, A.D. 1594, that "man of iron," the Augustinian, Alexis di Menexes, Archbishop of Goa, appeared amongst them ; with the result that their Metropolitan, Mar Joseph, was sent a prisoner to Rome, and they were forced into obedience to the Pope. What conviction failed to do that the Inquisition effected. In five years Menexes convened the famous Synod of Diamper, in which the independence of the Christians of St. Thomas was trampled out under the heel of the Vatican. By a decree of the synod the Syrian MSS. were destroyed, and their service-books and liturgy altered so as to assimilate the Roman worship. But the abolition of their service-books so embittered them against Rome that, after the successes of the Dutch in the middle of the seventeenth century, half of their number were enabled to shake off the Roman yoke ; but, not succeeding in procuring a Nestorian bishop, they passed over to Jacobitism, obtaining bishops from Alexandria and

sometimes from Diarbekr. The gentle spirit of the Gospel might have made them Catholics; Roman bigotry and intolerance drove them into a fresh heresy, and Jacobites, two thirds of the Christians of St. Thomas, still remain. The remaining third became Uniats; but in 1862 the Church of Travancore (the country south of Malabar), obtained a bishop from Mesopotamia, and to him about 81,000 Uniats adhered.

(5.) Next in importance to the Orthodox Church is the Armenian, with its five or six millions of highly industrious and intellectual people; the great commercial race of the East. The Armenians ascribe the foundation of their Church to St. Thaddæus, who is commemorated by them on February 18; and traces of Christian worship exist in Armenia, as early as the time of Tertullian. Eusebius says[g] that Dionysius of Alexandria "sent a Letter on Repentance to the brethren of Armenia, of whom Merozanes was bishop," which seems to show that part of the country was already Christianized. But the general conversion of Armenia is ascribed to St. Gregory the Illuminator, the son of a Parthian Prince, and a relative of the King, in the reign of Tiridates III. (286—342). Gregory, having offended the King by refusing to join in the Pagan worship, was thrown into a mud-pit infested with reptiles, the usual punishment of common malefactors; where for fourteen years he was supported by a Christian woman named Anna. When Armenia was visited by a plague, Gregory was summoned from his pit, with the result that the King and people were restored to health, and, in 302, baptized in the waters of the Euphrates. Gregory having received consecration, as

[g] H.E. VI. 46.

Catholicos of Armenia, from Leontius, bishop of Cæsarea, fixed his see in his native village Vagarshabad, to which he gave the name Etchmiadzen (*descent of the Holy One*), from a vision of the Saviour which appeared to him. Bishops and Priests came over from Syria and Greece, of whom Gregory became Metropolitan ; and from respect to its founder the Armenian Church was always *αὐτοκέφαλος*. The conversion of Armenia took place before the time of Constantine the Great ; Armenia therefore enjoys the distinction of being the first National Church converted to Christianity.

Gregory died in 332, having in the previous year resigned the see to end his days as a hermit in the desert. After him, first his two sons and then his grandsons, who together with him are commemorated as Saints in the Armenian Church, occupied the throne of Etchmiadzen, with the title of Catholicos. The last Catholicos of the family was St. Isaac (390—441), who, in conjunction with St. Mesrob, invented a national alphabet and translated the Bible into the new language. St. Mesrob succeeded St. Isaac as Catholicos, but in six months followed him to the grave. The next Catholicos was Joseph (441—perhaps 452). About that time the dynasty of the Arsacidæ made way for the Sassanidæ, who endeavoured to eradicate Christianity and bring Armenia back to the religion of Zoroaster ; and under fearful persecution the primatial see was removed to Tovin. The persecution had a further unfortunate consequence ; for in the midst of these troubles the Council of Chalcedon was held, at which the Armenian Church was unable to be represented.

The Armenian Church had given its assent to the Councils of Nicæa and Ephesus ; and the doctrine of the

Two Natures had been established. The Council of Chalcedon the Armenians did not regard from a doctrinal point of view, but as a Council which Pope Leo, through his legates, ruled, to take advantage of the rivalry between Constantinople and Alexandria, and establish his own supremacy. They consequently, A.D. 491, at the Synod of Vagarshabad, convoked by their Catholicos Babken, rejected the Council; and the rejection was renewed at the Synod of Tovin held, A.D. 552, under their Catholicos Nierses II.

After the Council of Chalcedon they accepted, not Eutychianism but, the doctrine of the One United Nature. This is the account they give of themselves: they are not, and never were, Monophysites, nor does the Orthodox Church so consider them; their not mixing water with wine in the Eucharist, and using unleavened bread they do not associate with doctrine.

The Armenian Church recognizes, as canonical, four Books not recognized by any other Communion; in the Old Testament the History of Joseph and Asenath, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; in the New Testament the Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul, and the Third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.

The Armenians, though perpetually exposed to persecution, have preserved their Christian profession with unflinching firmness; and have always preferred martyrdom to the faith of Mahomet. In 1367 their country was overrun by the Mamelukes, from whom they suffered severe persecution. Persecuted by the Mahometans, they from time to time sought Western help, and more than one Patriarch truckled to Rome and acknowledged the Pope's supremacy; but, as with the Greek Emperors, so it was with Armenians, from political motives, and

owing to Court influence. But at the Council of Florence a not inconsiderable number subscribed the Union, and are known as Uniat Armenians, using their own liturgy and ritual, and having their own Patriarch at Constantinople.

A schism caused by the Jesuits was a source of weakness to the Armenian Church, but its condition was ameliorated by Peter the Great. Further protection was afforded in 1766 to the Catholicos Simeon by Catharine II. By the treaty of 1828 Etchmiadzen became part of the Russian Empire; and by a Ukase of 1836 the Armenian Church was recognized by the Russian Government. Armenian massacres are unfortunately too recent events to need recapitulating.

The Armenian Church is governed by three Catholicoses, of whom the principal resides at Etchmiadzen, at the foot of Mount Ararat, his diocese comprising the Greater Armenia, with four Archbishops under his jurisdiction. The second, with twelve bishops under him, resides at Cis in Cilicia, with churches owning his jurisdiction in Cappadocia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and in Syria. A third, and last in rank, with eight or nine bishops under him, resides at Aghtamar, on Lake Van; but his office is of more recent origin; the Catholicos was long under the excommunication of the other two, and is still an object of suspicion. There are also titular Patriarchs in Constantinople and Jerusalem, and also a Patriarch in Poland; but they all perform their duties subject to the Patriarch at Etchmiadzen. The Uniat Armenians in Poland are subject to a bishop resident at Lemberg.

(6.) The Maronites, the sole remnant of the Monothelite heresy, derive their name from a monastery founded by St. Maro, a contemporary of St. Chrysostom, near Mount

Lebanon. They are said to have elected, about A.D. 700, as their first Patriarch, John Maro, for whom they obtained consecration from bishops of the party of Macarius, the monothelite Patriarch of Antioch, deposed at the Sixth Œcumenical Council; Maro won over the monks of Mount Lebanon and assumed the title, which his successors have continued to bear, of Patriarch of Antioch.

The Maronites constitute a nation rather than a religion, forming, with the Druses, nearly the whole population of Mount Lebanon. In 1182, during the Crusades, they renounced the monothelite heresy, and the whole Church or nation was brought, through Aymeric, the Latin Patriarch of Antioch, to acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, whose most ultramontane adherents they may be considered to be; but as Uniats, retaining their own observances, the Syrian Missal, and the marriage of their Priests; whilst in the election of their Patriarch they enjoy complete independence. Besides their Patriarch, who resides in the convent of Kennobin (*Cœnobium*), and takes at his consecration the name of Peter, as his rival of the Jacobite Church does that of Ignatius, they have eight bishops, with their sees at Aleppo, Tripoli, Byblus, Heliopolis, Damascus, Beyrout, Cyprus, Tyre and Sidon. The Orthodox Greeks also have at the present day a Church, although greatly outnumbered by the Maronites, who number about 200,000 adherents, on Mount Lebanon.

CHAPTER VII.

The Second Council of Nicæa.

After the murder of Justinian II. the rebellious army proclaimed as Emperor a General named Philippicus (*Bardanes;* 711—713), a monothelite, who appointed in the place of the orthodox Cyrus, whom he deposed, and who retired into a monastery, a monothelite Patriarch of Constantinople, John VI. (712—715).

Acting on the advice of John, Philippicus ordered, in 712, the removal from St. Sophia's at Constantinople, of a picture representing the Sixth Œcumenical Council, which condemned monothelitism; and he also ordered the removal of similar representations at Rome. Constantine, who was still Pope, so far from complying with the order, caused pictures of the six Œcumenical Councils to be set up in the porch of St. Peter's, and at a council denounced the Emperor as an apostate. After Philippicus was blinded and confined in a monastery, John joined the Orthodox Church.

Since the teaching and practice of the Greek Church with regard to images or Icons is much misunderstood, it may be as well, before entering on the great Iconoclastic controversy, to adduce the authority on the subject of two of the greatest of the Greek Fathers, St. Basil and St. John Damascene. "We worship," says the latter[a], "the image of the precious and life-giving Cross, not honouring the tree (God forbid), but the image as the

[a] B. IV. 11.

symbol of Christ." And St. Basil [b]; "the honour paid to the image passes on to the prototype." The letter sometimes attributed to Basil [c], which speaks of kissing the images of saints and martyrs, is supposed to be the work of a Greek writer during the Iconoclastic controversy.

That controversy, one of the most remarkable in the annals of the Church, and one of the most important, inasmuch as it produced the revolt of Italy from the Empire, the temporal power of the Popes, and the restoration of the Western Empire, culminating in the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches, owed its origin to a low-born and illiterate, but by no means unintellectual, Isaurian, who from a common soldier rose through his military talents to the highest rank in the imperial army; and was through the suffrages of the soldiers raised to the throne as Leo III. (716—741), the founder of the Isaurian dynasty.

When Leo came to the throne the followers of Mahomet were carrying all before them. In 711, the Moors, who had embraced Mahometanism, defeated in the battle of Xeres the Spanish King Roderic; in three years effected the conquest of Spain, and put an end to the Visigothic Kingdom, after it had lasted 300 years. The same year that witnessed the overthrow of Roderic witnessed also the conquest of Scinde, and the first Mahometan settlement in India. They now contemplated the completion of the conquest of the Roman Empire. In 717 they made a second attack upon Constantinople [d]. The Saracenic army consisted of 180,000 picked warriors; their fleet,

[b] De Spiritu, IV. 45. [c] Ep. CCCLX.; P.N.F. Vol. VIII. p. 326.
[d] Gibbon, X. 8.

now recruited by the navies of Egypt and Syria, numbered 1,800 vessels, making, in the language of the Greeks, the Bosphorus to resemble a moving forest; the Greek fire which had discomforted Moawiyah again fought for the defenders, whilst famine, disease, and shipwreck desolated the Saracens, who were completely defeated, only five of their ships returning to Alexandria to tell the tale of the unparalleled disaster.

The defence of Constantinople was conducted by Leo, and to his able military dispositions the great victory was due; it arrested the torrent of Mahometan conquest, and paved the way for Charles Martel's great victory of 732, which saved Gaul, and perhaps Italy, from the clutches of the infidels.

The affection, which, as a consequence of his victory over the formidable Saracens, the army bore to Leo and the Isaurian dynasty, forms an important element in the controversy on which we are now entering.

The Iconoclastic controversy which Leo originated was closely connected with the monotheistic susceptibilities of the Mahometans, who viewed with indignation anything which seemed to them to detract from the worship of the one God; and taunted the Christians with what they considered idolatry. Not believing in the Incarnation, they were not in a position to be judges in the matter; as St. John Damascene says[e], "Who can make any imitation of the invisible, incorporeal, uncircumscribed, formless God? to give form to the Deity is the height of folly and impiety." What the Mahometans regarded as derogatory to the majesty of God, the Christians intended as an outward expression of the

[e] B. IV. 16.

Humanity of Christ, on the principle of St. John Damascene, *ὅπερ ἀκοὴ ὁ λόγος, τοῦτο ὁράσει ἡ εἰκών.*

The Greek Church had always been opposed to the Latin statues, as too near an approach to an infringement of the Second Commandment. In the Western Church statues had been abused. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, removed and broke images in the churches of his Diocese, because of their abuse. Pope Gregory I., whilst he praised his right feeling with regard to their abuse, blamed him for breaking them; "quia eas adorare vetuisses omnino laudavimus, fregisse vero reprehendimus;" and then he goes on to explain, "aliud enim est picturam adorare, aliud per picturæ historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere[f]."

The icons of the Greek Church were merely paintings and mosaics; but there is no doubt that the Trullan Council had given a stimulus to the cultus of icons, which reached its height in the eighth century. Canon LXXXII. of that council forbade representations of the Saviour in the form of a lamb, but allowed them in the human form. This plainly included sculptures and statues, and that an excess existed may be taken for granted; in fact this is shown by the decision arrived at in the Second Council of Nicæa. There is no ground for imputing to Leo unworthy motives, beyond the desire of a low-born peasant, suddenly exalted to a dangerous height of power, of magnifying his own despotic authority. A monophysite by birth, he had learnt amongst his Isaurian mountains a simpler faith, and felt the justice of the taunt of the Mahometans. But it was a complicated difficulty which an ordinary layman was unfitted

[f] Ep. XIII.

to grasp; a reformation was needed, but it was objectionable that it should proceed, not from the constituted authorities or from a synod, but from an overstrained idea of an illiterate Emperor of his rights over the Church. What Germanus advocated was not sculptures or statues, but such icons as had always been lawful in the Greek Church, and that no change should be made without a General Council.

Having in the sixth year of his reign ordered the Jews and Montanists to be baptized, he was himself for the first ten years content to abide by the ritual of the Orthodox Church. Suddenly and unexpectedly he, in 726, issued an edict against the images, ordering them to be raised to such a height that the people could not kiss them; and forbidding prostration before them. In 730 he issued a more severe edict, and at once met with a strenuous opponent in the Patriarch Germanus I. (715—730), who had been translated from Cyzicus to Constantinople, and became as strong a defender of the images, as he had before been their opponent. Leo was at first contented with the removal of pictures and images from public places, or their being raised to a greater height. But when, probably after the second edict, an imperial officer further proceeded to hew in pieces a miracle-working figure of the Saviour over the Brazen Gate at Constantinople, the fury of the people knew no bounds; the women of the city overturned the ladder on which he was mounted, and he was beaten to death by the clubs of the populace. The Emperor sent soldiers to quell the riot and a terrible massacre was the consequence. The people of Greece and the Cyclades, instigated by the monks, the staunch supporters of the images, rose in rebellion, denouncing the enemy of Christ,

of His Mother, and of the saints. They proclaimed as Emperor one Cosmas, and fitted out a fleet against Constantinople; the fleet was destroyed, and the leaders were either killed in battle or, with the usurper, executed.

The Patriarch Germanus and Pope Gregory II. (715—731) resented interference of the civil power in what affected the doctrine of the Church, and made common cause against the Emperor. The Pope told him that all the kingdoms of the West regarded the Pope as a God upon earth; (*Θεὸν ἐπίγαιον*); that Christians and unbelievers alike were scandalized at his impiety; he accused him of such ignorance that, if he entered their schoolroom, the very children would throw their tablets at his head. Gregory, unlike several of his immediate predecessors who were Greeks or Syrians, was Roman, and was able safely to threaten the Emperor with excommunication. Leo retaliated by confiscating the patrimony of the Pope in Sicily and Calabria, withdrawing those provinces, as well as Eastern Illyricum, from his jurisdiction, and placing them under the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Patriarch Germanus more than 90 years of age, worn out with the struggle, much to the delight of the Emperor, resigned the Patriarchate, to which Anastasius I. (731—753), the Emperor's secretary, and an iconoclast, with whom the Pope refused to communicate, was appointed.

A staunch opponent of the Emperor, and the ablest defender of the time of the images, was John Mansur (to call him by his Arabic name), better known from his birthplace, Damascus, as St. John Damascene, the leading theologian of the age; the last of the Greek Fathers, and "the first of their poets," Dr. Neale calls him. Born of Christian parents towards the end of the seventh century,

and having received his education from a learned Greek monk named Cosmas, whom his father Sergius rescued from slavery to the Saracens, he was appointed on his father's death to succeed him as Vizier at Damascus. After the publication of the Emperor's second edict, John, though a subject of the Caliph, boldly entered the lists against him, and through able pamphlets which he wrote he gained the clergy, but especially the monks, to the cause of the images. This so enraged the Emperor that he resorted to treachery. The story goes that under a false accusation of treasonable designs against the Mahometans John was sentenced to have his right hand cut off; the sentence was duly executed, but on the same night the hand was restored through the intercession of the Virgin Mary, and the Caliph being thus convinced of his innocence, asked his forgiveness and ordered him to be re-instated in his office. Wearied with the world and the world's honours, John retired into the Lavra of St. Sabas, where Cosmas was already an inmate; there to the end of his life he continued to prosecute his studies, and to advocate the cause of the icons, leaving the Lavra on one notable occasion, for the purpose of kindling opposition to the iconoclastic measures of the Emperor Constantine; and dying A.D. 755.

Pope Gregory II. was succeeded by Gregory III. (731—741), a Syrian, a Pope even more energetic than his predecessor in favour of the images; the iconoclastic controversy gave the Popes the long sought opportunity of taking measures for shaking off their dependence on the Eastern Emperor, and Gregory was the last Pope for whose consecration the sanction of an Eastern Emperor was either sought or required.

Leo III., dying in June, 741, was succeeded by his son

Constantine V. (κοπρώνυμος) (741—775), who had in 733 married the daughter of the Khan of the Khazars, who was baptized into the Greek Church under the name Irene. As all that is known of the Emperor is derived from his enemies, who stigmatize him as an atheist, and attribute to him every kind of vice, it is impossible to arrive at a just estimate of his character; that he was mercilessly cruel there can be no doubt; nor that he was even a more fanatical iconoclast than his father had been; whilst the Empress, who is described as a pious Princess, though she was bound at her marriage to denounce them, was a secret favourer of the icons. During his reign the persecution of the iconolatrists continued and increased.

Shortly after the commencement of his reign, Artavasdes, who had married the Emperor's sister Anna, headed a rebellion of the Orthodox party, whom by his advocacy of the icons he had enlisted on his side; and was crowned by the Patriarch Anastasius, the tool of the Emperor Leo, but who had turned round to Orthodoxy. Constantine having, by the capture of Constantinople in November, 743, recovered the throne, removed the images which had been restored by Artavasdes; the Orthodox bishop of Gangra, who had taken part in the insurrection, was beheaded, whilst the Patriarch, blinded and seated on an ass, his head turned towards the tail, was thus ignominiously paraded through the city[g]; he was then allowed to retain the Patriarchate till his death in 753.

From February 10—August 8, 754, the Emperor held a conciliabulum, wrongly styling itself the seventh Œcumenical Council, in the vicinity of Constantinople. No

[g] A similar story is however told of his successor, Constantine II. (754—766); and the story of Anastasius, though related by Theophanes, is omitted by Nicephorus.

Patriarch was present nor represented; the Œcumenical throne was vacant by the death of Anastasius; the three other Greek Patriarchates were subject to the Saracens; and Pope Stephen of Rome refused to attend. It was attended by 338 Eastern bishops, under the presidency of Theodosius, Archbishop of Ephesus, an Iconoclast, and occasionally of the bishop of Perga. The previous sessions were held on the Asiatic side, the last, at which the Emperor was present, in the Church of Blachernæ, on the European side, of the Bosphorus.

On August 27 the subservient prelates, together with the Emperor and the Patriarch, Constantine II., who had been translated from the see of Sylæum to succeed Anastasius, signed the decree of the conciliabulum. It declared its adherence to the six Œcumenical Councils; it denounced those who depicted an icon of Christ as either monophysites or Nestorians, and those who depicted icons of the Virgin, Apostles, or Prophets, as imitators of the heathen worshippers. Two Natures were united in Christ; no picture therefore can depict Him; His only proper representation is the Holy Eucharist. It disproved the view of the Iconolatrists from Scripture and the Fathers, and anathematized and subjected them to severe punishment. Holy vestments and vessels, and all that was dedicated to divine service, were allowed to remain, as before, with figures. Several anathemas were appended, under which were included the late Patriarch Germanus, George, whose identity is uncertain, and Mansur (St. John Damascene).

Troubles which beset the Western part of the Empire, and which in his iconoclastic zeal he had overlooked, now engaged the attention of the Emperor, and delayed for a time the execution of the decree of the council

The Lombards having taken Rome and threatening Ravenna, Pope Stephen III. (752—757), despairing of help from the Emperor, who was absorbed by his iconoclastic difficulties, crossed the Alps, and sought the aid of Pipin the Little, whom, with his two sons, one of whom was the future Charlemagne, he, in July, 754, anointed as kings, Pipin promising the aid he required. In the performance of his promise he not only saved Rome from the Lombards, but he forced the Lombard king Agilulf to surrender Ravenna and the cities of the exarchate, which he bestowed on the Popedom. Thus commenced what is known as the patrimony of Peter; thus was laid the foundation of Rome's temporal power, and the Popes, no longer the subjects of the Eastern Emperors, took their place amongst the sovereigns of the world. To the ambassadors whom Constantine sent to Pipin, requesting him to restore the lands, Pipin answered: "The Franks had not shed their blood for the Greeks but for St. Peter and the salvation of their souls, and he would not for all the gold in the world take back the promise which he had made to the Roman Church."

Mortified by continued opposition to the council of 754, the Emperor began to set himself in 756 to the complete extirpation of the cultus of icons; with a view to which he prohibited private individuals from possessing icons, and exacted an oath against them from all his subjects. The secular clergy obeyed the edict, but the monks being his chief opponents, he determined to eradicate monasticism. That the monks in their opposition to the Emperor went beyond the bounds of discretion, seems not to be denied. They denounced the Emperor as a second Mahomet, and all iconoclasts as atheists and blasphemers. The vengeance he took was terrible. Monks

from various parts of the Empire were imprisoned, cruelly scourged, and mutilated. The monastic societies were dissolved, their lands and cattle confiscated, the monasteries converted into taverns, barracks, or stables. The monastic profession was prescribed, the monks were forced to assume secular attire, and the consecrated virgins to marry. The beautiful church at Chalcedon, in which the fourth Œcumenical Synod had been held, in which St. Euphemia was buried, was converted into a stable, and her coffin was with difficulty rescued from being thrown into the sea. The Patriarch though an iconoclast, yet, because he had once been a monk, was compelled to swear from the pulpit by the Holy Ghost, not only never to be an iconoclatrist, but that he abjured the monastic vow. Having afterwards offended the Emperor he was deposed and banished; being brought back to Constantinople, after suffering the same cruel treatment as was reported of his predecessor, he was beheaded, Nicetas, a man of Slavic birth and an eunuch, and from this latter cause canonically incapacitated, being appointed Patriarch (766—780).

The Emperor Constantine died in 775. His son and successor Leo IV., surnamed from his mother's nationality, Khazarus (775—780), was a man of gentle and religious character; though himself no favourer of the images, he was generally inclined to toleration; the laws against the icons continued unrepealed, but persecution ceased; a reaction set in in favour of the monks, who were allowed to return and rebuild their monasteries. The Emperor's wife, named, like his mother, Irene, an Athenian of great beauty, though compelled by Constantine at her marriage to abandon the veneration of icons, to which she had been accustomed at Athens, was during her husband's

life-time only a secret favourer of the images; but on the death of Leo, she, as guardian of her young son, the Emperor Constantine VI. (780—797), a boy ten years of age, determined on the restoration of the images, towards which she took the first step, by issuing an edict for the toleration of all parties.

On the death of Nicetas in the last year of the late Emperor's life, Paul IV., a man of learning and inclined to favour the images, was elected Patriarch, on binding himself not to restore the icons; but conscience-smitten on account of his vow, he, in 784, abdicated the Patriarchate, retiring into a monastery to do penance; and at his death, which occurred shortly afterwards, earnestly pleaded that a General Council should be held, as the only means of healing the iconoclastic schism.

In order to have a Patriarch favourable to her views, Irene appointed her secretary Tarasius (784—806), a layman but a strong supporter of the images, who was canonized for his Orthodoxy [h]. He having gone through the different orders of the ministry was consecrated to the Patriarchate, making it a condition that a council should be convened. He at once renewed communion, which owing to the iconoclastic troubles had been broken off, with the other Eastern Patriarchs; and wrote to them as well as to Pope Adrian I. (772—795) requesting their co-operation in assembling a General Council. Irene also determined that it should be one of such importance as to counteract the Council of 754, and she and the Emperor wrote to the Pope requesting that his "paternal Blessedness" would attend it either in person or by learned representatives.

[h] Tarasius was probably canonized solely for his zeal for the images.

The Council accordingly met at Constantinople in August, 786. The people, but especially the poorer classes, had always been favourable to the images, their principal opponents being the army, who still held the memory of the iconoclastic Emperors, Leo and Constantine, in honour. The Imperial Guards now assuming a threatening attitude, Irene, having first replaced them by others more favourable to her views, arranged for the Council to be transferred to Nicæa, as being at a convenient distance from the Court; and there the Seventh Œcumenical Council, consisting of about 350 Eastern bishops or their deputies, and attended by two delegates of Pope Adrian, met on September 24, 787, under the presidency of Tarasius, Nicephorus, subsequently Patriarch of Constantinople, being secretary. There were also present two monks of Palestine, John and Thomas, who represented themselves as legates of the Eastern Patriarchs, Politian of Alexandria and Theodore of Antioch, who, owing to their subjection to the Saracens, were unable to attend; the see of Jerusalem was vacant.

Between September 24 and October 23, the last day of the Council, there were eight sessions, the eighth being held in the Imperial Palace at Constantinople; and twenty-two disciplinary canons, not affecting the icons, were passed.

Between A.D. 726, when the first iconoclastic decree was issued, and the assembling of the Second Council of Nicæa, more than sixty years had intervened. It is difficult to imagine how so many as 338 bishops, unless they had been intimidated by the Emperor, could have decided against the icons at the Council of 754, whilst 308 bishops subscribed the decrees of Nicæa. But on the other hand it was a time when simony was rife, and

many bishops had purchased their sees; such men it can easily be imagined might not be over-scrupulous in regulating their conduct, with regard to the external matters of religion, under court influence, rather than forfeit their sees. At the same time they would gladly embrace a religious instead of an imperial policy; so that, at the very commencement of the sittings, a number of prelates who had taken part with the iconoclasts returned to Orthodoxy, and were absolved by Tarasius.

The case of those prelates having been considered in the first three sessions, on September 24, 26 and 28, they, on expressing sorrow for their previous error, were allowed to retain their sees. In session IV. (October 1), passages in favour of the icons having been adduced from Scripture, the Fathers, and the late Trullan Council, the canons of which were ascribed to the Sixth Œcumenical Council, the late conciliabulum was condemned as a Judaizing Sanhedrim, and the present Synod was declared to be in agreement with the six Œcumenical Councils. In session V. (October 4), other passages in favour of them having been adduced, it was decreed that the icons should be everywhere restored and that prayers should be offered before them. In session VI. (October 6) the decree (ὅρος) of the pseudo-synod and a refutation of it was read, its assumptions were exposed and refuted, and it was shown that many quotations from the Fathers were spurious or garbled.

In session VII. (October 13) the ὅρος of the Council was read; it declared that the present Council neither intended to add to nor detract from the six Œcumenical Councils; the Creeds of Nicæa and Constantinople were rehearsed; and several heretics, including Pope Honorius, were condemned. The Second Council of Nicæa sat 107

years after the Sixth Œcumenical Council; it will thus be seen that the condemnation of Honorius was continued; nor did the Roman legates raise their voice against it; and the Roman Church reckons the Second Council of Nicæa amongst the Œcumenical Councils.

The ruling (ὅρος) of the Council declared that, together with the venerable and life-giving Cross, icons of our Lord, His Mother, the Angels and the Saints might be set up, whether in colours, or mosaics, or any other material; that they might be depicted on sacred vessels or vestments; on the walls and on tablets in churches; in houses, and by the way-side; the oftener they were looked upon (ὅσῳ συνεχῶς ὁρῶνται) the more would people be stirred up in remembrance of the originals (προτοτύπων); that greeting (ἀσπασμόν) and honourable reverence (τιμητικὴν προσκύνησιν) be paid them, but not actual worship (ἀληθινὴν λατρείαν), which belongs exclusively to God. (Thus the distinction is clearly drawn between proskunesis, a word which cannot be exactly defined in any other language but the Greek, and latreia, the former of which may be given to God's creatures, the latter to God alone; thus clearing the Greek Church of any charge of idolatry.) Incense (θυμιάματα) and lights were to be burnt in their honour, "as has been with the ancients" (κάθως καὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις εἴθισται). "Whoever does reverence (προσκυνεῖ) to an image does reverence to the person whom it represents." The opponents of the icons were anathematized by name; bishops and secular clergy who objected to them were to be deposed; monks and laymen excommunicated.

In session VIII., which was held in the Imperial Palace at Constantinople on October 23, the ὅρος of the Council was a second time read in the presence of Irene and

the Emperor, and subscribed by Irene, the Emperor, and 310 bishops:—"this we believe; this is the faith of the Apostles, of the Fathers, and of the Orthodox; believing in One God we salute the honourable icons;" and the anathema pronounced in the seventh session was repeated.

Of the twenty-two Canons we will mention the most important. Canon I. The clergy must observe the divine canons, viz. the holy Apostolical canons and those of the six Œcumenical Councils, as well as of local councils assembled to promulge them. It thus, like the Trullan Council, accepted all the eighty-five Apostolical canons. III. The election by Princes of bishops, presbyters, and deacons is invalid; a bishop must only be elected by bishops, and consecrated by all the bishops of the Province, or at least three. IV. and V. were directed against the prevalent evil of simony. VI. enacted that, agreeably to Canon VIII. of the Sixth Œcumenical Council (by which is meant the Trullan Council), a provincial synod should be held once every year. VII. Whereas churches had been consecrated by the Iconoclasts without relics, relics must now be placed in them with the customary prayers, and no churches should in future be dedicated without relics, on pain of deposition. By XVIII. women were forbidden to reside in bishops' houses or in monasteries. By XX. double monasteries were forbidden; and a monk was prohibited from conversing with a female relative, except in a monastery in the presence of the Hegumena. XXI. forbade monks and nuns to go from one monastery to another.

The Second Council of Nicæa was the last of the councils that can lay claim to the title of Œcumenical,

for it was the last of the councils previous to the great schism of the Eastern and Western Churches, which has rendered the assembling of such a Council impracticable. It has therefore never been recognized by any undoubted Œcumenical Council; but it was recognized by the council which the Latins call, but the Greeks do not, the Eighth General Council, as well as by the council which the Greeks called formerly the Eighth General Council; it therefore received the recognition both of Eastern and Western Christendom, which is all that is necessary to render a council Œcumenical; and it effected for a time a better understanding between the Eastern and Western Churches.

Pope Adrian accepted the decrees of the Council; but he went further than the Greek Church in allowing, not only paintings and mosaics, but also sculptured icons; and Italy followed the example of the Pope. The Pope sent a Latin copy of the Acts to Charlemagne, who in 768 succeeded his father Pipin; and on the death of his brother Carloman in 771, became sole King of the Franks. With regard to the Second Council of Nicæa, Charlemagne took up an intermediate position opposed alike to that of the Pope and that of the Iconoclasts.

Instead of accepting the Acts of the Council as binding on the Gallican Church, Charlemagne summoned in 794 the Council of Frankfort, which was attended by 300 bishops from France, Italy, and Germany, and probably from England, as well as two bishops as representatives of the Pope. Charlemagne himself presided. The council declared the Second Council of Nicæa not to be a General Council, and repudiated its decrees; "septima apud Græcos vocata universalis pseudo-synodus de imaginibus;" it decreed that images "in ecclesiis memoriæ et

ornamenti causâ retineri posse, omnem vero cultum penitus esse abrogandum."

Roger de Hoveden, writing under 792, says that Charlemagne sent a copy of the decrees of the Second Council of Nicæa to the Anglican Church, which returned a refutation of them. In 824 or 825 the Gallican bishops held the Council of Paris, which was an echo of the Council of Frankfort; nor was the Second Council of Nicæa till two centuries afterwards recognized by the Gallican Church. Œcumenical though the Council was, it is evident that a strong feeling against the images existed in the West, and for such reasons many people have hesitated to accept the Second Council of Nicæa as an Œcumenical Council.

The Isaurian dynasty came to an end through the deposition, after he had been blinded by his unnatural mother, of the Emperor Constantine, after which event Irene reigned alone for five years (787—802). The government of the Empire by a female, and one of Irene's character, gave Pope Leo III. the long sought for opportunity of shaking off the subjection to the Eastern Emperors. The Pope was deeply indebted to Charlemagne; what Charlemagne's father commenced, Charlemagne completed; under him the Lombard Kingdom in Italy came to an end. In 774 Charlemagne was crowned King of Lombardy, and not only did he confirm the grant made to the Popedom by Pipin, but he increased the Patrimony of Peter by a large part of the territory which he had conquered from the Lombard King.

Charlemagne could now style himself "King of the Franks and Lombards, and Patrician of Rome." On Christmas Day, A.D. 800, 324 years after the abeyance

of the Western Empire, as Charlemagne was kneeling at Mass at the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome, the grateful Pope, as if moved by a heavenly impulse, in imitation of the coronation of the Emperors by the Patriarchs of Constantinople, suddenly placed upon his head a golden crown. It was a direct act of rebellion on the part of the Pope against his Eastern sovereign, for which the Iconoclastic troubles had paved the way; ever since the time of Leo the Isaurian Italy had been in a state of smothered revolt, and the Popes regarded the King of the Franks as the champion of the faith and defender of the holy see. Leo was only the spokesman of the people who hated the Greeks and welcomed the Franks; Charlemagne affected surprise, but surprise soon gave way to satisfaction when he learnt, from the joyful acclamations of the multitude both within and without the Church, that there had been a preconcerted arrangement between Pope and people; "Long life and victory to the august Charles, crowned by God, the great and pacific Emperor."

Thus was founded the Holy Roman Empire, with its capital at Aix-la-Chapelle. Thenceforward the Roman Empire was governed by two Emperors, not, says Mr. Bryce, as before A.D. 476, the conjoint heads of a single realm, but rivals and enemies, each styling himself the Roman Emperor, each professing to be the true and lawful head of the Christian Church and people. The Greek Emperors no longer possessed authority over the West. The Pope sent to Charlemagne, as tokens of submission, a Roman standard and the keys of the sepulchre of St. Peter; George, Patriarch of Jerusalem, sent him the keys of the Holy Sepulchre. It need scarcely be said that the revival through a Pope of the

Western Empire immensely added to the prestige of the Popes. The Pope had set up a potentate equal to the Emperor in the East; raised above all the Kings and Princes of the West; the protector of the Western Church, without which protection recent events had shown the Popedom could not stand.

About the same time the Popes of Rome received an immense leverage by means of a forged compilation known as the Pseudo-Isidore Decrees, the work of an impostor, styling himself Isidorus Mercator, and purporting to be that of St. Isidore, bishop of Seville (595—636). There was nothing in the history of the Popes to warrant their claims, and one object of the document was to make the Pope of Rome the universal bishop, a title which belonged to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The slip of mercator for peccator (*sinner*),—the humble title by which bishops designated themselves—was sufficient to expose what Roman Catholics in the present day allow to have been a forgery.

The Second Council of Nicæa weakened, it did not kill, iconoclasm, which lasted on, with various results, 55 years longer, under five Emperors, one approving, another condemning the decrees of the Council. In 802 Irene was dethroned and banished to Lesbos, in a conspiracy under her secretary Nicephorus, who then became Emperor (802—811). Tarasius dying in 806, was succeeded by the historian Nicephorus (806—820), as yet a layman, the most learned writer since St. John Damascene. The new Emperor was a favourer of the Isaurian dynasty, and as such, had little sympathy with the iconolatrists, whom, however, except the monks, he generally tolerated. In 811, Nicephorus was defeated in battle by the Bulgarians, a savage people, whom we shall find before the end of

the century converted to Christianity by the Greek Church; his army was pursued to Adrianople, where the bishop and a large number of Christians were taken captive; Nicephorus himself being slain and decapitated, and his head converted into a drinking-cup. His son Stauracius was then declared Emperor, but he having received a mortal wound in the same battle, Michael I. (*Rhangabe*), a favourer of the images, who had married the daughter of Nicephorus, became Emperor (812—813). Michael being dethroned in a mutiny of the army retired into a monastery, and was succeeded by Leo V. (the Armenian; 813—820), who, from his religious inconsistency, acquired the name of chameleon. Finding an opponent in the orthodox Patriarch, he deposed him, and appointed Theodotus (820—821), Nicephorus spending the remaining twelve years in a monastery, where he completed his history.

Leo the Armenian, in a provincial synod at Constantinople in 815, under Theodotus, confirmed the acts of the synod of 754, rescinded the canons of the Second Nicene Council, anathematized the iconolatrists, and ordered the removal of the icons from the churches. On Christmas Day, 820, whilst attending early Mass in his private chapel, he was assassinated by conspirators disguised as choristers, and was succeeded by Michael II. (Balbus, *stammerer;* 820—829), who was under sentence of death for conspiracy against the late Emperor. He advocated the retention of the icons *pro scripturâ*, and proclaimed a toleration for both parties. He having died a natural death, the first Emperor who had done so for 50 years, says Mr. Oman, in the History of the Nations, was succeeded by his son Theophilus (829—842), who married Theodora, a beautiful Paphlagonian

lady[1]. Theophilus, who in other respects was a just and tolerant ruler, was a bigoted iconoclast, and almost as cruel a persecutor of those who, since the Second Council of Nicæa, must be called the Orthodox party as Copronymus had been before him. His education he owed to John, who, from his learning, was styled the Grammarian, like himself an iconoclast; he now became, in succession to Antony (821—832), Patriarch of Constantinople as John VII. (832—842).

The most zealous champion of Orthodoxy since St. John Damascene was Theodore Studita. Having been excommunicated by Constantine VI. for opposing his divorce of his wife, an Armenian Princess, and his marrying another, he was banished to Thessalonica. Irene, when sole Empress, recalled him and appointed him abbot of the monastery of Studium, near Constantinople, where he raised the number of monks from twelve to a thousand. Banished again in 719, this time to Smyrna, by Leo the Armenian, he was again recalled by Michael the Stammerer. But the toleration afforded by Michael to the Iconoclasts offended the Orthodox party, and their uncompromising champion was again banished in 823; and after wandering about from place to place died in the Island of St. Trypho on November 11, 826, the day of his death being still commemorated by the Greek Church.

On the death of Theophilus the long and weary iconoclastic controversy came to an end in the victory of the iconolatrists. His widow, St. Theodora, for she has been canonized both by the Greek and Latin Church, who was appointed regent during the minority of their son,

[1] For the story of the Golden Apple, see Theoph. Chron. sub Theophilus.

Michael III. (842—867), a boy three or four years of age, was as enthusiastic in favour of the images as her husband had been against them. The character of the new Emperor when he grew up is delineated in his sobriquet *the Drunkard.* Theodora at once determined to restore the icons, and, having deposed John the Grammarian, she appointed in his place Methodius I. (842—846), a strong supporter of the Orthodox party; and from him she obtained reluctant absolution for the iconoclastic delinquencies of her husband. In 842 she convened a synod at Constantinople, in which the decrees of the Second Council of Nicæa were reaffirmed and the icons restored to the churches; and to the present day on the Festival called ἡ Κυριακὴ τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας (the dies Dominica of Orthodoxy), the Greek Church commemorates the event[k]. We will quote the words of Dean Milman[l]: "There was a tacit compromise; nothing appeared but paintings, mosaics, engravings on cups and chalices, embroidery on vestments. The renunciation of sculpture grew into a passionate aversion. The Greek at length held that kind of more definite representation of the Deity or Saints, with the aversion of a Jew or a Mahometan."

The final victory having been achieved, Theodora caused the bodies of Theodore Studita, of the Patriarch Nicephorus, and of the Iconoclatrists who had been banished for their faith, to be translated to the Capital.

Much has been said in praise of the Iconoclastic Emperors, but they were generally famous in other respects than for their religion. We will conclude this chapter in the words of the late Archbishop Trench[m]:

[k] Smith's *Account of the Greek Church*, p. 38; Finlay II. 165.
[l] Lat. Christ. VI. 413; large Ed. [m] Med. Ch. Hist., Ch. 7.

"No one will deny that, with the rarest exceptions, all the religious earnestness, all which constituted the quickening power of a Church, was ranged upon the other side. Had the Iconoclasts triumphed, when their work showed itself at last in its true colours, it would have proved to be the triumph not of faith in an invisible God, but of frivolous unbelief in an incarnate Saviour."

CHAPTER VIII.

Photius and the Great Schism.

No man has from his birth to his grave, and beyond his grave, been pursued by more bitter calumny and injustice, than the great Patriarch of Constantinople, Photius [a], the most learned man of his day; the author of the Nomo-canon, the basis of Greek canon-law, and of the famous Bibliotheca, a work in which he has collated more than 250 ecclesiastical writers. His character has descended to us as depicted by, or derived through, Roman enemies. The Dominican Le Quien, under the heading "Photius Tyrannus," bestows on him every epithet of vituperation which malice could invent: "nequissimus veterator:" "perfrictae frontis homo:" "nebulo:" and he speaks of his having occupied the patriarchal throne "impiè."

Two great men, Photius and Pope Nicolas I. were pitted against each other in a hotly-contested struggle for the pre-eminence of their sees; of whom Photius was, certainly intellectually, as he was, when we think of Nicolas as the supporter of the pseudo-Isidore Decretals, morally, the superior. The anecdote of Photius having, on an occasion, drunk more cups than Michael the Drunkard, may be dismissed; for if it occurred before he became Patriarch, it was probably done out of bravado; but the writer of the story insinuates that it was done afterwards, at which period of his life his character was unimpeachable.

[a] "Ejus temporis eruditissimus." Theoph. Chron. sub Michael.

We must narrate the circumstances which preceded his appointment to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In the revolution of 813, which dethroned Michael Rhangabe, his two sons, the younger of whom was named Nicetas, sought refuge, from the jealousy and persecution of Leo the Armenian, in a monastery of the Propontis, where Nicetas assumed the monastic name of Ignatius, and of which he became Archimandrite. There, says his biographer, he learnt the whole of the Old and New Testaments, and diligently studied the Fathers, imitating their example, and bringing forth the fruit of a holy life.

After the assassination of Leo the Armenian, his son Gregory was subjected to similar treatment to that dealt out to the family of Rhangabe. In time Gregory became bishop of Syracuse; but, being driven from his See by the Saracens, he took up his residence at Constantinople. On the death of Methodius, he and Ignatius were put in competition for the Patriarchate; and Ignatius, who was a favourer of the images, and a man of eminently holy life, was, through the patronage of Theodora, elected (846—857; 867—877). Irritated by the opposition of Gregory, Ignatius forbade him to take part in his consecration; this unfortunate proceeding created an ill-feeling between the two; the bishops of Sardis and Apamea took the side of Gregory, and withdrew from Communion with Ignatius, who, in a synod, A.D. 854, excommunicated Gregory, his act meeting with the approval of Pope Leo IV. (847—855), who bore no good towards the Archbishop of a see, which had been taken from Rome and conferred on Constantinople by Leo the Isaurian.

The appointment of so holy a Patriarch as Ignatius was little calculated to be acceptable to the profligate Court

of Michael the Drunkard, and his powerful minister Bardas (the brother of Theodora), whose notoriously immoral life laid him open to the censures of the Church; and when, on Advent Sunday, 857, a day on which it was customary for high officials to receive the Holy Eucharist, the Patriarch refused to communicate him, Bardas prevailed on Michael to consign Theodora and her daughters to a monastery, and, under a false accusation, to depose Ignatius and to banish him to Terebinthus.

Feeling that the people would resent the deposition of so holy and beloved a Patriarch, Bardas, by way of appeasing their indignation, induced the prelates to sanction the appointment of Photius, a man of unblemished character, and the most learned man of the day; who, he felt, by his established reputation as a statesman, a theologian, and even a physician, would be acceptable to all parties.

Photius had the misfortune of having such a patron as Bardas, whose tool he has unjustly been accused of being. But with his many faults Bardas had one redeeming virtue; he was an ardent supporter and promoter of literature, and had applied himself to a revival of learning. There was thus between the two the bond of literature, in which Bardas probably had the aid and encouragement of Photius. Everything, except the fact of his being a layman, favoured the election of Photius, and there were recent precedents in Tarasius and Nicephorus, of laymen being appointed Patriarchs; so that that would cause little comment in Constantinople. Born of an illustrious family, from whom he inherited a veneration for the images, both his father and his mother having, as was supposed, suffered martyrdom under one of the iconoclastic Emperors; his brother, the husband of the

Empress's sister; himself the nephew of the late Patriarch Tarasius; having also held several high civil appointments, and lately conducted with success an important mission to the Court of Bagdad; his Bibliotheca having been already published; the prelates of Constantinople having pledged themselves to receive him; he reluctantly accepted the Patriarchate (857—867; 877—886). He affirmed that it was forced upon him by the bishops and clergy; and as he wrote the same to Bardas, who was in a position to deny it if it was untrue, there can be no doubt as to the truth of the statement.

The different Orders of the ministry he received from Gregory of Syracuse, a circumstance which is alone sufficient to account for the hostility which he encountered from the Popes. The year following his election Nicolas I. (*the Great*) became Pope of Rome (858—867), the greatest of the Popes since Gregory the Great; and a Pope who carried the Papal pretensions higher than any of his predecessors.

The Œcumenical Council of Ephesus had decreed that no addition should be made to the Creed; and this was confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon and the Fifth and Sixth Œcumenical Councils; and so important did Pope Leo III. (795—816) consider the verbal adherence to the Creed, that he caused it, in the very words of the Council of Constantinople, to be graven in Greek and Latin on two silver plates, and set up in St. Peter's at Rome. Nicolas was the first Pope to order the addition of the Filioque; and it was on this point that the contest between him and Photius principally turned. Photius did not make leavened or unleavened bread a crucial test.

In his controversy with Photius, Pope Nicolas took advantage of the False Decretals, such a palpable forgery

that Pope Pius VI. (1775—1799) declared that they ought to be burnt. The object of the forgery was to exalt the Papal power; we will only quote two passages from them to show how well calculated they were to effect their object. One is: "The head of the Church is the Roman Pontiff." The other: "The Church of Rome has the unique privilege of opening and shutting the gates of Heaven to whom she will." This now universally acknowledged forgery Nicolas asserted was preserved in the archives of the Roman Church [b].

Photius, as was usual, announced his election to the Pope of Rome. Ignatius refusing to resign the Patriarchate, two parties, each excommunicating the other, the party of Ignatius and the party of Photius, arose in Constantinople. Bardas continued to subject Ignatius to gross injustice and cruelty, and he was banished to Mitilene. Smarting under persecution from Bardas, Ignatius, the lawful Patriarch of the Eastern, naturally sought the aid of the head of the Western Church. The clergy now went over to the side of Ignatius, whom persecution had doubly endeared to them; and though Photius interceded for him with the Emperor, and obtained his recall, the whole odium of the persecution fell upon Photius. It was probably the unjust treatment to which he was subjected that induced Photius to excommunicate Ignatius a second time.

Nicolas seized the opportunity, through helping the oppressed Ignatius, of exalting his own Patriarchate through humbling the rival Patriarchate of Constantinople; and thus arose the penultimate stage in the conflict between East and West. Great disorder pre-

[b] Littledale's *Plain Reasons*, p. 118.

vailed, and frightful orgies were enacted, at Constantinople. The low debauchee Michael laughed at both parties; Ignatius he styled the Patriarch of the people; Photius the Patriarch of Bardas; whilst he himself in his drunken revels mimicked the Patriarchal office.

The conversion of the Slavic nations was the principal event in the latter half of the ninth century; and as Slavic Bulgaria forms an important element in the conflict between Nicolas and Photius, this seems a fitting place to give an account of the conversion of the Slavs to Christianity.

That Christianity previously existed amongst the Slavs, we have seen an instance in the case of the Patriarch Nicetas; there were also Christian Slavs amongst the officers of Constantine the Great. But these were probably isolated cases, and there was no national conversion, till it was effected by Constantine, who is better known under his monastic name of Cyril, and his elder brother Methodius; who, though bearers of Greek names (as was also their father Leo), and natives of Thessalonica, a Greek city, were eminently fitted for their work as "the Apostles of the Slavs;" Thessalonica having been conquered by the Slavs towards the end of the sixth century, and Slavic being the predominant language of the country.

The two brothers embraced in their early years the monastic life, Methodius in a monastery on Mount Olympus, Cyril on the shore of the Sea of Marmora. Cyril was soon prevailed upon to accept a chair of philosophy at Constantinople, where he gained the title of *philosopher;* but he resigned it to join Methodius on Mount Olympus. In A.D. 850, envoys from the Khan of the Khazars (a Turanian people living in the neighbour-

hood of the Crimea), a daughter of whose Khan the Emperor Justinian II., during his banishment, had married, arrived at the Court of Michael the Drunkard, requesting him to send to them some well-instructed missionary, to refute the Jews and Mussulmans. Cyril was accordingly selected, and, accompanied by Methodius, proceeded to Cherson in the Crimea; there they found the tomb of St. Clement, bishop of Rome (92—100), whom a legend makes to have been banished by Trajan to the Chersonese, and there to have suffered martyrdom. From Cherson Cyril went to the Khazars, who, through him, were converted to Christianity, and attached to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He then went, accompanied by Methodius, to Constantinople, whither they transferred the relics of St. Clement.

The two brothers had translated portions of the Bible into the Slavic language for the Slavs of Thessalonica. News of this translation having reached the Slavs of Moravia, their Grand Duke Vratislaf and his nephew Sviatopolk sent, A.D. 863, envoys to Michael; (to use the words of Nestor): "We Slavs," they said, "understand neither the Greek nor Latin language; the one teaches in one sense, the other in another; do thou therefore send us teachers capable of instructing us in the letter and spirit of the Sacred Writings."

We must go back a few years in the history of Moravia in order to understand the linguistic difficulty which attended the teaching of the two brothers. Christianity had been introduced into parts of Moravia in the time of Charlemagne, who, agreeably to his usual custom, forced the people to accept Baptism. When he drove out the Avars from the neighbouring country of Pannonia, Charlemagne divided the country between the Arch-

bishops of Salzburg and Passau; an arrangement which was confirmed by Louis the German. The people of Moravia however felt that Christianity forced upon them by a Western Emperor endangered their nationality, and it was barely kept from dying out by the two Archbishops.

Moimir, the first Moravian Prince known to history, having been deposed by Louis the German, was succeeded by Vratislaf, whom Louis, expecting to find him a more pliant tool, placed upon the throne. In 855 Vratislaf conquered Louis in battle, and made Moravia the centre of a powerful Empire; the German bishops who had settled in the country were driven out, and Vratislaf, determining to receive Christianity from the Greek Church, sent, as stated above, to Michael for missionaries.

Michael, acting by the advice of the Patriarch Photius, sent to Moravia the two brothers, who, taking with them the bones of St. Clement, and passing through Bulgaria, arrived at Moravia at the end of 863, or the beginning of 864. Cyril "by the help of God" applied himself to invent an alphabet for the Slavs, as Mesrob had done for the Armenians, and Ulphilas for the Goths. Into the difference between the Cyrillic and Glagolithic languages it is not necessary to enter. Rabanus Maurus, who became bishop of Mayence, A.D. 847, attributed the invention of the Glagol to a venerable presbyter named Jerome, in the eighth century; Pope Innocent IV., in 1248, improved upon this, and was the first to attribute it to the Latin Father St. Jerome; but this is generally considered a pious fraud to gain credit for the Latin Church. D'Avril (p. 150) says, "Saint Cyrille n'a pas ecrit en Cyrillique mais en Glagolitique." It is reasonable to suppose that he

taught the Moravians in the language which he invented for them ; in any case, by the translation of the Bible, and a further translation of the Breviary and Liturgy, and by preaching to them in a language which they could understand, whereas the Germans had used the Latin language, they soon won the people to the Greek Church; "the Slavs," says Nestor, "rejoiced to hear the majesty of God preached to them in their language."

The opposition of the German clergy to the use of any language in the Church, except the three inscribed on the Cross, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin, now induced the two brothers to apply to Pope Nicolas, and to avail themselves of his invitation to visit him at Rome. Taking with them the relics of St. Clement, they started for Rome, to find on their arrival Nicolas dead and Adrian II. (867—872), Pope, who conceded to them the use of the Slavic language, on the ground that God had made other languages besides Hebrew, Greek and Latin.

At Rome, St. Cyril died in 867, entreating Methodius with his last words not to return to Mount Olympus, but to devote himself to missionary work ; and he was buried at Rome in the Church of San Clemente, where the bones of St. Clement had been deposited.

About the same time as Moravia, Bulgaria was converted to Christianity. The Bulgarians of history are essentially Slavic ; originally Turanians, they had, before the time of which we are writing, changed their nationality and their language.

The seeds of Christianity had already been sown in their country by Greek Christians, whom the Bulgarians had taken captive in their wars with the Eastern Empire. One of these captives, a monk named Theodore Cupharas,

had converted many Bulgarians to Christianity, and had endeavoured (although unsuccessfully) to gain over their Tsar, Bogoris or Boris. After a captivity in Constantinople of 30 years, during which she had received Baptism, Boris' sister was exchanged for Cupharas ; and on her return to Bulgaria succeeded in instilling into the mind of Boris the principles of Christianity. Cyril and Methodius on their way to Moravia passed through Bulgaria, where they preached on ground ready prepared for them ; (the Moravian tradition that the whole of Bulgaria was converted by them is rendered improbable by the shortness of their stay ; but) they confirmed the faith of the still Pagan, but wavering, Boris, who was shortly afterwards (A.D. 864) baptized by the Patriarch Photius, the Emperor Michael (whose name he took in exchange for his own), standing as his sponsor ; and Photius sent to the royal convert the Orthodox Creed, with the Filioque omitted.

Moravia, as we shall see presently, was afterwards incorporated in Bohemia, but to Moravia Bohemia owed its Christianity. In 871, the Bohemian Prince Borsevoi married the sister of Sviatopolk of Moravia (the afterwards canonized), Ludmila ; and in the same year they received Baptism in the Greek Church, from Ignatius, who was at the time Patriarch of Constantinople.

After the death of Borsevoi in 894, in spite of the pious endeavours of Ludmila, Paganism held its own in the country, till the reign of her grandson Wenceslaus (928—936), who was educated under her care and inherited her saintliness. He being killed in an insurrection under his pagan brother, Boleslav the Cruel, lives in the veneration of the people as the patron Saint of Bohemia. After his death Christianity underwent several

vicissitudes, until the Bohemian Church was re-organized under a bishopric at Prague, founded about A.D. 970 with the consent of the Emperor Otto I. The Bohemians, notwithstanding the opposition of the German clergy, had continued to adhere to the Slavic ritual and Slavic language; until Pope John XIII. (965—972), when the Bishopric of Prague was founded, imposed the condition that their services should be performed according to the Latin ritual; "non secundum ritus aut sectas Bulgariæ gentis, vel Russiæ vel Slavoniæ linguæ."

From Bohemia Christianity spread into the tribes of Slavic Poland. Poland passes from the domain of legend into that of history, in the reign of Duke Mieczyslav I. (962—992). In order to obtain in marriage the hand of Dambrouka, daughter of Boleslav, Duke of Bohemia, he was induced to embrace Christianity; and as he was a vassal of the Emperor Otto I., it was Latin Christianity. But the Duke's compulsory suppression of Paganism, and the enforcement, under the guidance of Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, of Christianity on his people, met with such obstinate resistance that it made little progress; and fifteen years after its conversion, half of Poland was still pagan.

So long as Poland was a fief of the German Empire, it had the single bishopric of Posen, subject to the Metropolitan of Magdeburg. Mieczyslav was succeeded by his son Boleslav I. (992—1025), surnamed the Great, who was even more zealous than his father in suppressing Paganism. He introduced into the country missionaries from Moravia; thus Poland was affected by the teaching of Cyril and Methodius, and Eastern rites left their trace on the Polish Church.

The German Emperor, Otto III., visiting Poland in

A.D. 1000, conferred the royal title on Boleslav; freed its Church from the jurisdiction of Magdeburg; and created Gnesen as the metropolitan see. Thus the Greek Church was overshadowed, and Poland became more thoroughly Latinized. Boleslav was succeeded by his son Mieczyslav II. (1025—1034), during whose reign such a state of anarchy prevailed, as to threaten the very existence of Christianity in the land. He was succeeded by his son Casimir I. (1034—1058), a Benedictine monk, who was released from his vows by Pope Benedict IX.; by Casimir an impulse was given to Christianity, which gained a firm footing in Poland. But Casimir, being a Roman Catholic, and indebted to the Pope, swept away whatever traces remained of Greek Christianity, and Poland was thus wholly brought under the supremacy of Rome.

Methodius having been, after the death of Cyril, consecrated Metropolitan for Moravia and Pannonia, without any fixed Diocese, resumed his duties, first in Pannonia and then in Moravia; but, although he was acting under commission from the Pope, the Germans refused to recognize him as Metropolitan.

In 870 Vratislav, betrayed by his rebellious nephew, Sviatopolk, was deposed by Leo the German, and succeeded by Sviatopolk (870—894), who now took the side of the German bishops. Methodius having again, through his use of the Slavic language, incurred the wrath of the Germans, was, on that account, and also on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, accused, in 880, of heresy before Pope John VIII. (872—882), the successor of Adrian. Presenting himself before the Pope, he established his orthodoxy; (for, if the Germans had, even through Pope Nicolas, insisted upon it in his

dealings with Photius, the Italians had not yet added the Filioque to the Creed [c];) and he was confirmed in his Metropolitan rights, with permission to use the Slavic language, with regard to which the Pope in his letter to Sviatopolk used much the same language as his predecessor.

Notwithstanding Pope John's decision in his favour, opposition from Sviatopolk and persecution from the German bishops, who found a supporter in Pope Stephen V., pursued Methodius to his death, which occurred A.D. 885. Methodius nominated as his successor Gorazd, a Moravian of noble birth, thinking that he, being a high-born native, might secure justice for the Slavic language; but under a general persecution by the Germans, he and his Slavic priests were, in the following year, driven out of the country, and found a home in Bulgaria.

There they completed the conversion of the country. Boris was still alive; "il aimait beaucoup," says M. D'Avril, "a s'entretenir avec eux, et raconter les histoires des martyrs et des péres de l'Église." Boris appointed Gorazd Metropolitan of Bulgaria, and St. Clement, another of the followers of Methodius, Archbishop of Ochrida, the capital of his dominions. Gorazd was succeeded as Metropolitan by St. Clement, and after him came five other followers of Methodius; and to this day, says M. Leger, the Bulgarian Church commemorates in its services "the Seven Apostles" (*οἱ ἅγιοι ἑπταριθμοί*).

Sviatopolk died A.D. 894, and with him passed away the glory of Moravia. He was succeeded by his son Moimir II.; Germans and Slavs united when it was too late; the Battle of Pressburg, A.D. 907, was lost by the Christians; the Moravian Kingdom was overthrown by

[c] See further on in this chapter.

the Magyars; and when the Moravian Church again appears on the pages of history, it was subject to the see of Bohemia.

The Latin Church did not let the dead Methodius rest in peace. The Roman Church strangely confused the Slavs with the Arian Goths; it speaks of "Gothicas literas a quodam Methodio hæretico inventas;" and of Methodius as "divino judicio repentinâ morte damnatus." When a Synod of Slavs appealed to Pope Alexander II. (1061—1073) for a withdrawal of the obnoxious condemnation of their language, they were told that it could not be granted "propter Arianos hujusmodi literaturæ inventores." The Slavs still continued the struggle for their language till, A.D. 1080, Pope Gregory VII. (*Hildebrand*) wrote a violent letter to Vratislav, Duke of Bohemia, entirely prohibiting its use. In parts of Bohemia, however, it continued to hold its ground, and, says Giessler, one convent in Prague uses it in the present day.

Of the conversion of Slavic Russia we shall speak in a future chapter; and must now return to Photius, and his contention with Pope Nicolas.

Photius, as has been before said, wrote to Nicolas, announcing his election. Michael also wrote to the Pope, requesting him to send legates to assist at a council that was to meet at Constantinople, for the purpose of restoring union and discipline in the Church.

Nicolas sent to Constantinople two legates, as Michael desired, Rodvald, bishop of Porto, and Zacharias, bishop of Anagni; but with the further instructions, to demand the restitution of the provinces of which Leo the Isaurian had deprived the Papal See; as well as that the Archbishop of Syracuse should receive consecration at Rome.

Michael, irritated at the assumption of the Pope, placed the legates, as turbulent subjects, under arrest.

The Synod, at which Ignatius was present, met at Constantinople in 862, and was attended by 318 bishops, the same number as at the First Council of Nicæa. It confirmed the deposition of Ignatius and the appointment of Photius, the judgment being acquiesced in by the Papal legates, who, by way of appeasing the Pope, condemned Iconoclasm; and Ignatius, cruelly beaten and scarcely knowing what he did, was compelled to subscribe in his prison his own condemnation.

It was alleged at Rome that the legates were bribed[d]. The Pope disowned the part taken by them, and at a council at Rome in the same year, declared Photius deposed; annulled the Orders conferred by him; and threatened him with excommunication. He sent an encyclical to the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and the other Metropolitans and bishops of the Greek Church, asserting his Apostolical authority over Photius; and in another council at Rome in the following year, excommunicated his legate, Zacharias, as well as Photius and Gregory of Syracuse.

The Emperor and Photius treated the excommunication with indifference, and Photius continued Patriarch. Michael wrote a violent letter to the Pope; he threw in his teeth his ignorance of the Greek language, and spoke of the Latin, in which Nicolas wrote, as "a barbarous jargon," language which drew from the Pope a well merited rebuke.

In 866 Cæsar Bardas was assassinated, and Basil I. was associated as Emperor with Michael. The ill-feeling

[d] "Corruptis legatis ut impiæ sententiæ subscriberent." Le Quien I. 24.

which the Pope's action created at Constantinople was increased by the Bulgarians breaking away from the Greek, and joining the Latin, Church. Two years after his Baptism, whether because he feared that his connexion with the Greek Church threatened his political independence; or because Latin missionaries had instilled into his mind doubts as to the omission of the Filioque; or because he had, in the meantime, learnt more of the character of his sponsor, Michael the Drunkard; Boris had misgivings as to his Greek Baptism, and applied to Louis the German and Pope Nicolas for Latin instruction.

The Pope sent two bishops, one being the future Pope, Formosus of Porto, with a long letter containing no fewer than 106 objections to the Greek Church, and thus induced the Bulgarians to sever their connection with the Greek, and to join the Latin, Church. In answer to a question as to how many Patriarchs there were, the Pope answered, "only three;" those of Jerusalem and Constantinople being excluded; Constantinople, he said, was not of Apostolical foundation, nor recognized by the great Council of Nicæa; (the Pope did not tell them that Constantinople was not at that time founded;) and that its bishop was only called Patriarch by royal favour. The Bulgarians were so charmed with Formosus, that they expelled the Greek Clergy; and Boris requested that Formosus might be appointed Archbishop of Bulgaria; Formosus, however, was not in favour at Rome, and this was not granted.

In a council at Constantinople, A.D. 867, Photius drew up his famous Encyclical, containing eight articles against the Latin Church;—(1) the observance of Saturdays as Fasts; (2) the partaking of milk and cheese during Lent;

(3) clerical celibacy; (4) the restriction of Chrism to bishops; (5) the double Procession of the Holy Ghost; (6) the promotion of those in deacon's Orders to the episcopate; (7) the consecration of a lamb on the Altar at Easter; (8) shaving the beards of the Clergy. At the council a sentence of excommunication against the Pope, which representatives of the three absent Eastern Patriarchs and nearly 100 prelates signed, was drawn up.

So long as Photius enjoyed the favour of the Court he was safe. A revolution at Constantinople, in which Michael was murdered at the instigation of Basil I., who then became sole Emperor (867—886), led to a revolution in the Church; Photius condemning the execution of Bardas, and the murder of Michael, was deposed, and Ignatius re-instated in the Patriarchate (867—877). In the same year Pope Nicolas died, and his successor, Adrian II. (867—872), confirmed the deposition of Photius.

The Eastern Emperor was now in accord with the Pope, and in 869 the deposition of Photius was confirmed by an obsequious synod at Constantinople consisting of only 102 bishops. The most prominent subject brought before the Council was the Procession of the Holy Ghost, Photius accusing the Latins with having adulterated the Creed of Constantinople, the legates of the Pope vigorously defending the Procession. Everything was decided as the Emperor and Pope wished; Photius was anathematized and degraded, and his Ordinations annulled, the sentence of condemnation being written in the Sacramental Wine. The council which approved this sacrilegious proceeding, the Roman Church dignifies as the Eighth Œcumenical. The council accepted as Œcumenical the Second Council of Nicæa.

The Papal legates, relying on the complacency of the

Emperor, thought the circumstances opportune for reclaiming the alienated provinces, and the Pope's jurisdiction over Bulgaria. Bulgaria had now returned to its allegiance to the Greek Church; in vain the Papal legates urged the superiority of the Roman See; the Greeks recognized no such superiority; and Ignatius, who was as resolute as Photius in the matter of Bulgaria, consecrated Theophilus, a Greek, as its first Metropolitan.

Photius was now kept for several years in exile, treated with great cruelty, without company and without books; and Ignatius was left in peaceable possession of the Patriarchate, till his death in October, 877. Notwithstanding the threat of the Pope to excommunicate and depose him, for refusing to recall the Greek Bishops from Bulgaria, Ignatius is a canonized Saint of the Roman Church.

The Emperor, finding that the majority of the Eastern bishops were in his favour, had already recalled Photius from banishment, and appointed him tutor to his sons; he now did a simple act of justice in re-instating him, with the concurrence of the Eastern Bishops, in the Patriarchate; and Italy being at the time threatened by the Saracens, the reigning Pope John VIII. had reason for obliging the Emperor, and approved his re-instatement. As to the Filioque, Pope John took the view of the Œcumenical Councils, opposed to that of Nicolas; (even if the Councils were left out of the question, either Pope John or Pope Nicolas must have been wrong, and therefore could not have been infallible;) Pope John wrote to Photius, condemning in the strongest terms its insertion in the Creed; those who did so, he said, "suâ insaniâ ausi sunt;" he condemned them "quasi transgressores divini verbi;"

"sicut theologiæ Christi Domini eversores, et Apostolorum et reliquorum sanctorum Patrum."

Photius, being under the condemnation of the former synod, determined to hold another synod at Constantinople, to sanction his re-instatement. A synod accordingly, with the approval of Pope John ("artibus delinitus" of Photius, says Le Quien), sat from November, 879, to March, 880. This, Macarius says[e], the Greek Church calls the Eighth Œcumenical Council; and it has a far greater claim to be so considered, than the council of 869; for, whereas in the first session of the latter only eighteen, and in the tenth and last only 102 prelates, sat; at the present council, 380 prelates assembled; the Pope was represented by the Cardinal Peter and two other legates; the three other Orthodox Patriarchs sent representatives, and Photius presided. Photius successfully defended his position, and the synod declared him to be the rightful Patriarch, the Cardinal and Papal legates acquiescing in everything, and anathematizing the council of 869. The Roman claim to Bulgaria was rejected as irrelevant. The addition of the Filioque was, with the approval of the legates, condemned. Pope John agreed with the decrees of the council, and recognized as lawful Patriarch Photius, who had been anathematized by the council which the Roman Church calls the Eighth Œcumenical, as well as at one time or another by nine Popes. The council, like its predecessor of 869, accepted as Œcumenical the Second Council of Nicæa.

It is difficult to determine which of the two Patriarchs, Ignatius or Photius, was the worse persecuted.

[e] III. 575.

Ignatius was unjustly deposed; Photius only accepted the Patriarchate when forced upon him. He was now again restored, but was not long left in peace. The Emperor Basil was succeeded by his son Leo VI. (*the Philosopher*, 886—912), who in the first year of his reign deposed him, in order to make room for his brother, a youth eighteen years of age. Pope John VIII. having met a violent death from assassination, Stephen V. was (after the short pontificates of Marinus I., who condemned Photius, and of Adrian III., who annulled the condemnation) elected Pope (885—891). To give some air of sanction to his arbitrary proceeding, Leo wrote to Stephen, addressing him as "sanctissimo et beatissimo Stephano," and giving him the title which belonged to the Patriarch of Constantinople, "Œcumenico." The end was that Photius died an exile in a convent in 891, and is commemorated in the Greek Church on February 19 (*n.s.*), whilst Stephen remained Patriarch till his death, in 893.

In their dealings with Photius the Popes do not appear to advantage. It is evident that the grievance at Rome was his consecration by the Archbishop of Syracuse. Photius had been undoubtedly consecrated by a bishop who, though expelled from his see by the Saracens, was still a bishop. Yet Formosus, who had been translated from the see of Pontus to the Popedom (891—896) treated his Orders as null and void, and insisted that those ordained by him should only be admitted to lay-Communion.

After the time of Photius, the schism, of more than thirty years standing between the Eastern and Western Churches, was to all outward appearances healed; and between his Patriarchate and that of Michael Cerularius,

the next Patriarch of whom there is much of importance to be related; although during the dark age of the Papacy little intercourse was kept up; such intercourse as existed between the two Churches was uninterrupted, and of a not unfriendly character.

At the commencement of the tenth century a schism occurred in the Patriarchate of Constantinople, owing to a fourth marriage of the Emperor Leo VI. The Patriarch Nicolas I. (*Mysticus*) had baptized, with the ceremonial of a legitimate Prince, the Emperor's son by his concubine Zoe, the future Emperor Constantine VII., on condition of his separating from her; instead of which he took her as his fourth wife. When the Patriarch refused to marry them, and punished the presbyter who performed the ceremony, and forbade Leo the Church, he was exiled, and Euthemius appointed, who approved the marriage on the ground of expediency, and admitted the Emperor to Communion; and an obsequious synod at Constantinople in 906 sanctioned the marriage, and confirmed the banishment; that the Emperor sought a dispensation from the infamous Pope Sergius III. (904—911) is without foundation.

Leo was succeeded by Constantine VII. (*Porphyrogenitus*, 912—958), a boy seven years of age, under the guardianship of his uncle Alexander, who reigned for one year as Emperor-regent. Nicolas was then re-instated and Euthemius banished, and Nicolas now recognized the action of Euthemius as done to avoid scandal to the Church.

After the death of Alexander the regency devolved on the Emperor's mother, Zoe, a woman of frivolous character, whose unpopularity led to the appointment of Romanus I. (*Lecapenus*) as joint Emperor (919—944),

and under him another Synod at Constantinople condemned the previous Synod of 906, and pronounced a fourth marriage unlawful.

Though the Bulgarians continued to adhere to the Greek Church, their Tsar Simeon (893—927), the son and successor of Boris, determined to have a Patriarch for Bulgaria. Having, A.D. 923, conquered Romanus in battle, he stipulated in the terms of peace for the acknowledgment of Bulgaria as a separate Patriarchate, with rank next to Constantinople; nor when, A.D. 970, John Zimisces conquered Bulgaria, could he or his successors destroy its ecclesiastical independence.

On the death, in 925, of the Patriarch Nicolas, Stephen, a eunuch, translated from the Archbishopric of Amasia, was appointed to succeed him; after holding the Patriarchate for three years, he was succeeded by Tryphon (928—933), as locum tenens for Theophylact, a debauched youth sixteen years of age, the son of the Emperor Romanus. It was the time of the so-called Roman Pornocracy; and the appointment of Theophylact received the confirmation of Pope John XI., the infamous son of the infamous Pope Sergius III., by whom he was, A.D. 933, consecrated Patriarch, and from whom he condescended to receive the Omophorion or Pall.

In the same year Eutychius, who has handed down the annals of the Alexandrian Church "ab orbe condito usque ad annum 940," became Patriarch of Alexandria (933—950).

Theophylact (933—956) lived, says Finlay (II. 301), like a debauched young Prince, spending his time in hunting, selling ecclesiastical preferments in order to raise money for his pleasures, defiling St. Sophia's with profane songs and indecent ceremonies, and converting its services

into musical festivities. Whilst he was celebrating Mass in the Cathedral, a page brought him word that a favourite mare had foaled; the Patriarch abruptly ended the service, and throwing off his vestments rushed from the Cathedral; and when he found all going on well returned to join the procession. He being killed through his horse throwing him against a wall, was succeeded by Polyeuktes (956—970).

The Emperor Constantine was succeeded by his son Romanus II. (959—963). Romanus dying unexpectedly at the age of 24 (not without suspicion of being poisoned by his wife, Theophano, a woman of low birth), left two sons, who succeeded as Emperors, Basil II. (963—1025), known as Bulgaroktonos (*Slayer of Bulgarians*), and Constantine VIII. (963—1028); and two daughters, Theophano, who became the wife of the Western Emperor Otto II., and Anna, wife of the Russian Grand Prince, Vladimir.

Although the Mahometan power had become considerably weakened by its division into the two rival Caliphates of Bagdad and Cordova, yet in the ninth century the four greatest powers in the world were the Eastern and Western Empires, and the Caliphates of Bagdad and Cordova. During that century the Saracens took from the Greeks, A.D. 823, in the reign of Michael the Stammerer, the Islands of Sicily and Crete. But they became further weakened by the rise of new powers and Emirates; professing only a nominal adherence to the Caliphates of Bagdad and Cordova. In the tenth century the Fatimites, pretending to be descendants of Mahomet's daughter, having founded Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, gained possession of Egypt, where they founded in 969 the Caliphate at Cairo.

Basil, who at the time of his accession was seven years of age (his brother Constantine being still younger), had as his colleague first, Nicephorus Phocas (963—969), who married Theophano, the widow of Romanus, and afterwards John Zimisces (969—976). During the reign of Basil the Eastern Empire attained its greatest height, and won back much which it had lost to the Saracens.

Nicephorus Phocas had already, A.D. 961, distinguished himself as a General by reconquering Crete and leading its Emir captive to Constantinople; in the following year capturing Hierapolis and Aleppo, the latter of which cities was the capital of another Emir. After he became Emperor, he continued his conquests by taking Cyprus in 965; in 968, he invaded Syria and recovered Antioch (which had been in the hands of the Saracens for three hundred and thirty years), Apamea, and Emesa; and threatened Bagdad. Returning in the following year to Constantinople, the good old Emperor was murdered by his wife Theophano, and one of her numerous lovers, John Zimisces, who had also distinguished himself in the Syrian war.

Zimisces, who was then proclaimed joint-Emperor, disappointed the infamous Theophano by refusing to marry her, and consigning her instead to a monastery. The intrepid Patriarch Polyeuktes at first refused to crown him; but the public indignation being appeased by the exile of Theophano, and Zimisces having exonerated himself by throwing the blame on his accomplice, he at length consented; the guilt of Zimisces was forgotten in his virtues; the profusion of his charities, and the gentleness of his character charmed all who approached him[f]. By his double triumph over the

[f] His victory over the Russian Grand Prince, Sviatoslaf, is narrated under the history of the Russian Church.

Russians and the Saracens, he derived the title of Saviour of the Empire and Conqueror of the East[g].

On his death, (not without suspicion of poison), Basil II. entered on his full inheritance, and completed the work of Nicephorus Phocas and Zimisces; and his reign, says Finlay (II., 368), was the culminating point of Byzantine greatness. His life was a strange mixture of war and religion. At the end of the ninth century Bulgaria began to rise to its highest point of power, which was further heightened by the conquests of its Tsar Simeon[h]. Sviatoslaf of Russia overcame the Bulgarian kingdom; but his disastrous defeat by John Zimisces in 972 involved the loss of Bulgaria to Russia, and its gain to the Roman Empire. But Bulgaria soon revolted, and a fresh conflict between Basil and Samuel, Tsar of Bulgaria, after having lasted 35 years, ended in the complete defeat of the latter in 1014; intelligence of an unparalleled act of barbarity on the part of Basil hastening the death of Samuel two days afterwards. In 1018, the last fortress of the kingdom, and with it Servia, over which the Tsar Simeon had extended the Bulgarian dominion, surrendered to Basil.

Basil next turned his arms against the Saracens, who had become further weakened by the establishment of the dynasty of the Fatimites at Cairo; Basil extended the conquests of the Empire over the Saracens; but his annexation of the Christian Kingdom of Armenia was a doubtful expedient, for it removed what might have been a useful barrier against future inroads of the Mussulmans. He ended his long reign just when he was at the point of sending an expedition to recover

[g] Gibbon, IX. 67.

[h] See p. 274.

Sicily, which had been in the hands of the Saracens since the time of Michael the Stammerer.

Basil was followed by his brother Constantine, who had hitherto been his colleague, as sole Emperor. Constantine, who was a mere man of pleasure, left three daughters, Eudocia, who retired into a convent, Zoe, and Theodora. Romanus III. (*Argyrus*) married Zoe when she was forty-eight years of age, and became Emperor (1028—1034). Constantine had desired that Romanus should marry his youngest daughter Theodora, but she had scruples about going through the form of marriage with a man who had a wife living; Zoe, less scrupulous, threatened him with death if he refused her hand. Thenceforward Theodora was an object of jealously to the Empress Zoe, and of suspicion to Romanus, who accused her of conspiring against the throne; and she was in consequence consigned to a monastery. Romanus, now entirely in the power of Zoe, died from the effects of slow poison, supposed to have been administered by her. Zoe had fallen in love with Michael, a handsome Paphlagonian money-lender, who had taken service in the Imperial household; and in the same night that she became a widow she became his wife. Michael was proclaimed Emperor as Michael IV. (*the Paphlagonian*, 1034—1042); the Patriarch Alexius (1025—1043) being compelled to perform the marriage and coronation services. Various conspiracies were formed against the low-born Emperor by the chief men in Constantinople, amongst whom was one, Michael Cerularius, who, in order to escape the punishment inflicted on his fellow conspirators, assumed the garb of a monk.

After the short reign of Michael V., who deposed Alexius, and the still shorter joint-reign of Zoe and

Theodora, Constantine IX. (*Monomachus*) became Emperor (1042—1054), "an old debauchee who had been Zoe's lover thirty years before[1]," whom Zoe now took as her third husband. Alexius was re-instated, but he dying shortly afterwards, the above-mentioned Michael Cerularius became Patriarch of Constantinople (1043—1059), and showed himself as restless an agitator in ecclesiastical, as he had before been in political, matters.

We have seen how the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, asserted Teutonic independence. When, in the tenth century, Christ's Vice-gerents (as the Popes of Rome styled themselves) exhibited the most revolting profanation in the history of Christendom, it was the German nation in the person of the three Ottos that virtually saved the Popedom. One hundred and fifty-two years had elapsed since the death of Photius; and before the end of that period the Roman Church, through the profligacy of the Popes, had again been brought to the verge of ruin. When at one and the same time three deeply simoniacal Popes ("three devils," Canon Robertson, quoting from a writer of that century, says they were called), the German Emperor, Henry III., was implored by the clergy and devout people of Rome to exercise his authority. At the Council of Sutri in 1046 he deposed all three Popes, and took the appointment to the Popedom in his own hands, bestowing it on several German bishops in succession; and thus a new era was inaugurated for the Roman Church.

In 1049 the Emperor appointed as Pope the bishop of Toul, a man of saintly character and with a high reputation for learning; who, after his election was

[1] Omar, Story of the Nations.

confirmed by the clergy and people of Rome, ascended the Papal throne as Leo IX. (1049—1054).

Ever since the time of Photius, though outward Communion was kept up between the two Churches, the Greek Church had grown distrustful of the orthodoxy of the Latins. The superiority of Greek culture and learning had always predisposed the Greeks to look down on the Latins; and a feeling of disgust at the abyss into which the Popes had fallen (although, as Mosheim says[k], few examples of piety might at the time have been conspicuous in the Greek Church), may explain, although it does not palliate, the over-bearing conduct of Cerularius, which brought about the final rupture between the two Churches.

Cerularius, in agreement with Leo of Achrida (*Ochrida*), which, since the time of the Tsar Samuel, had been the Patriarchal see of Bulgaria, addressed, styling himself, "universalis Patriarcha Novæ Romæ," a letter full of invective against the Latin Church, to the bishop of Trani, in Apulia; a country which Leo the Isaurian had taken from Rome and placed under the jurisdiction of Constantinople; and this letter he desired him to communicate to Pope Leo. Objectionable as the letter was, it was not more objectionable than the letters which Pope Nicolas had written to and about Photius. The chief contention between Photius and Nicolas had been the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Cerularius in his letter complained of several practices in the Roman Church: (1) the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist; (2) fasting on Saturdays in Lent; (3) eating things strangled and of blood; (4) not singing the Hallelujah in Lent.

[k] II. 471.

(1.) The weight of evidence leads to the conviction that in very early times both Greeks and Latins used ordinary bread, the Greeks using leavened bread, that being implied in their word ἄρτος (*raised*). Leontius, the second bishop of Kief[1], maintained that our Saviour instituted the Sacrament in leavened bread; for that the word ἄρτος always signifies something *raised*, unless joined with the word ἄζυμος. About the ninth century the Latin Church made unleavened bread the use for their Church, which they afterwards maintained had, in imitation of the institution by Christ, been the practice of the primitive Church. From the silence of Photius on the subject, and the prominence given to the Azyms by Cerularius, it would appear that, between the two periods, the practice of the Latin Church had gained greater frequency and notoriety.

(2.) Fasting on Saturdays in Lent was forbidden by canon LV. of the Trullan Council. In the Greek Church Saturday was always a Festival, except the Great Sabbath, the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Day, when the Saviour lay in the tomb; and Cerularius spoke of the Western practice as Jewish (*Judaicè*).

(3.) As late as century VIII. Pope Gregory III. (731—741) forbade the eating of blood or things strangled. In the Western Church the Apostolic rule[m] gradually died out, but in the Eastern Church it always continued, as its Euchologies show.

(4.) Cerularius blamed the Latins; "Item Alleluia in Quadrigesimâ non psallitis sed semel in Paschâ tantummodo." Singing the Alleluia in Lent was forbidden by

[1] See under Russian Church.

[m] Acts XV.

a Western Council, the Fourth of Toledo, A.D. 633; "In omnibus Quadrigesimæ diebus (quia tempus est non gaudii sed mæroris) Alleluia non decantetur, hoc enim ecclesiæ universalis consensio roboravit."

It is evident that the old grievance of Bulgaria still rankled in the breast of the Popes, for, in a letter to the Emperor Constantine, Leo urges the same claim which, in the time of Photius, Nicolas had made to Michael.

A copy of Cerularius' letter fell into the hands of Cardinal Humbert, who was at the time resident at Trani, and who translated it into Latin and sent it to the Pope.

The letter of Cerularius caused great astonishment and indignation at Rome, for the Greeks had been long acquainted with the Latin usages, and it appeared that Cerularius was seeking a quarrel. The Pope at first presented his case in more conciliatory language than that used by Cerularius. He immediately wrote reminding him that both in and outside Rome there were many Greek churches and monasteries, and that so far from prohibiting he had encouraged them, for uses differing according to time and circumstances were no hindrance to salvation. He sent three legates to Constantinople, Humbert himself, a man as self-willed and over-bearing as Cerularius, the Archbishop of Amalfi, and Frederic of Lorraine, Cardinal Archdeacon of Rome, the future Pope Stephen IX. (1057—1058), who took with them a second letter from Leo.

It was now evident that the contest on both sides was one for supremacy, and the Pope, to counteract the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, and to establish his own supremacy, like his predecessor Nicolas, did not scruple to appeal

to the pseudo-Isidore Decretals. It cannot be imagined that a man of Leo's saintly character would have appealed to them as genuine if he had known them to be (what every one now allows that they were) an imposition; but the fact remains that for 200 years the Popes, in order to establish their supremacy, had, however innocently, been trading on a forgery.

The Pope used much the same language as St. Gregory the Great used to John the Faster. He spoke of "the detestable and lamentable and sacrilegious usurpation by which you boast yourself the universal Patriarch;" he said that though the holy Council of Chalcedon had offered the title to his predecessor Leo the Great and his successors, none of them had assumed it[n]. He complained of the Greeks re-baptizing converts from the Latin Church; of their clergy marrying; and of their not allowing the Procession from the Holy Ghost.

The conduct of the profligate Emperor Constantine was marked by duplicity throughout. It was with him a matter of policy, at the time when the Normans were beginning to make conquests on the Eastern Empire, to stand well with the Pope, and he accordingly lodged the Papal legates in his palace, where Cerularius declined to visit them. Humbert then visited the Patriarch, in whose presence he assumed an arrogant tone, and managed to place himself as much in the wrong as Cerularius had been before. Cerularius wrote to Peter III. of Antioch that Humbert refused to discuss the points of difference, and insisted on unconditional surrender (*καὶ ταῦτα μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἀναισκυντίας ὑπερβαλλούσης*). Humbert brought one remarkable accusation against the Greek

[n] Le Quien, I. 91.

Church, viz. of expunging the Filioque from the Creed (*abscederunt a symbolo*). That uncatholic addition having found its way into the Creed at the Council of Toledo in Spain, its passage into France was easy, and about sixty years before the time of Charlemagne, Æneas, bishop of Paris, wrote "the whole Gallican Church uses the Creed in that form." At the synod of Friuli, in 796, the President Paulinus, bishop of Aquileia, stated that the words, "proceedeth from the Father and the Son," were added, at the Second Œcumenical Council, to the descent of the Holy Ghost. They had the support of Charlemagne, and it was his request that the Pope should recognize the interpolation, that induced Leo to inscribe the Creed in its right form in St. Peter's at Rome. Both Leo IX. and Cardinal Humbert were Frenchmen, and that fact, and perhaps an ignorance of history, explains Humbert's mistake. Cerularius, supported by the people, refused to give way; and on July 16, 1054, the Papal legates left a writ of excommunication on the Holy Table of St. Sophia's, and departed, shaking off the dust from their feet.

Pope Leo had died in the previous April. For some months previously to his death he had been a prisoner in the hands of the Normans. He was too much of a German and too independent to please, or to allow himself to be led by, Italians, and had he been living he might have had something to say to the over-bearing proceedings of his legates. The Churches had weathered as severe storms before; and that two hot-headed men like Michael Cerularius and Humbert should be left to themselves to rend in two the seamless robe of Christ, was a misfortune which can never sufficiently be deplored.

The Emperor lavished presents on the legates at their departure, and allowed the excommunication. Cerularius, in a synod at Constantinople, issued a counter-excommunication against the Latin Church; and Leontius and Peter, the orthodox Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, made common cause with the head of the Greek Church. No sooner were the legates out of sight and hearing, than Constantine ordered the Papal writ of excommunication to be burnt, and approved of Cerularius convening the synod which excommunicated the excommunicators.

Thus was effected the schism which was the culminating result of the long contest for supremacy between the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople.

The Greek Church has always under its Emperors and under its successive conquerors been opposed to oppression; but history carries us back to a time when the Patriarchs of Constantinople, if less arrogant than Cerularius, were fully as resolute in their claim for precedence as the Popes of Rome are in the present day.

To such a height of power were the Patriarchs of Constantinople raised, that Cerularius was able to depose the Emperor Michael VI. (*Stratioticus*, 1056—1057), and to obtain the election of Isaac I., the first of the dynasty of the Comneni, in his place. But as he did not possess the immunity which distance lent to the Western Patriarch, he laid himself open to the civil jurisdiction. "I made him Emperor and I can unmake him," he said, when Isaac determined to curb his haughty aspirations. Openly to seize the head of the Greek Church in the streets of Constantinople was a dangerous venture. When he was outside the walls of

the city he was arrested by the Imperial soldiers, and banished to Proconnesus, where his death saved the Emperor further trouble; and Constantine III. (*Leichudes*, 1059—1064), as yet a layman, was appointed his successor.

CHAPTER IX.

The Crusades and the Fall of Constantinople.

These two events are closely connected, for nothing more conduced to the Fall of Constantinople than the action of the Latins at, and after, the Fourth (so-called) Crusade.

The year 1048 (six years before the schism between East and West) was the date of the entrance of the Turks into the annals of ecclesiastical history; in that year Togrel Beg entered Persia, and inaugurated the undying hatred of the Turks for Christianity.

The dynasty of which Togrel was Sultan was not that of the Ottomans, of which we have such painful reminders in the present day, but of their predecessors, the Seljuks, who derived their name from Togrel's grandfather, Seljuk. In the last years of the tenth century, Seljuk, having quarrelled with his native Prince, retired from Turkestan to Samarcand, and embraced Mahometanism, and having wrested the power from the first Turkish dynasty, the Gaznevids, lost his life, at the age of 107, in battle against the Pagans.

The Seljuks inherited all that was bad and rejected whatever there was of good in the Mahometan faith. Togrel Beg (1037—1063), who wallowed in sensuality, in 1053 penetrated to Bagdad, and thenceforward took the first place amongst Mahometan Princes; and under him the wars of the Crescent against the Cross commenced, 130,000 Christians slain in battle being the holocaust which he offered to the false prophet.

The next Sultan in the line was his nephew, Alp Arslan (1063—1073), who in the Battle of Manzikert, A.D. 1071, defeated the Eastern Emperor Romanus IV., with the result that nearly all its Asiatic provinces were lost to the Empire, and the greater part of the Christian population exterminated.

Alp Arslan was succeeded by his son, Malek Shah (1073—1092), who, in 1076, subdued Syria and took Jerusalem. The capture of Jerusalem by Malek Shah was the immediate cause of the Crusades.

For 400 years Jerusalem had been subject to the Mahometan Caliphs of Bagdad, who regarded it as in sanctity second only to Mecca, and allowed Christian pilgrims to visit, unmolested, the Holy Sepulchre. A reasonable tax was imposed, in return for which food and accommodation was supplied to them on the road, and a comfortable hospice greeted them on their arrival.

Under the Seljuks all was changed, and a system of persecution ensued. The pilgrims, a large number of whom were French, returned home with pitiful tales of their sufferings in the Holy Land, and a cry for vengeance arose throughout Europe. The Eastern Emperor, Alexius I. (*Comnenus,* 1081 — 1118), wrote to Pope Urban II. (1088—1099) inviting him to Constantinople to discuss the schism between the Churches, and requesting him to enlist the sympathy of the German Princes against the Seljuk infidels.

In 1093, Peter the Hermit, who had been an eye-witness of the sufferings of the pilgrims, took counsel with Simeon, the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Simeon told him that no help could be expected from the Greeks, who could scarcely defend themselves, and

had, within the last few years, lost more than half their Empire. He gave him a letter to Pope Urban (a sign that communication between the Churches had not been wholly broken off), and to Urban Peter represented the miserable condition of the Christians in the East.

Urban, whose sympathy was thoroughly enlisted in the cause, held in 1095 two councils, one at Piacenza, the other at Clermont. "As you value your souls," he said at the latter council, "rush quickly to the defence of the Eastern Church. It is from her the glad tidings of your salvation emanated; she dropped into your mouths the heavenly milk on which you feed; she passed on the inestimable dogmas of the Gospel for you to imbibe." The Saviour, he told them, would be their leader; the penance due for their sins remitted and absolution secured; sufferings they would endure, but death would be a blessed martyrdom.

In answer to the appeal of the Pope, a unanimous shout of *God wills it* was returned; the religious enthusiasm spread over Europe; and August 15, 1096, was fixed for the departure of a Crusade to the Holy Land.

The history has been so frequently and fully written that we shall confine ourselves to the briefest summary of the Crusades.

The First Crusade, preached by Peter the Hermit, started for the Holy Land under the command of Godfrey de Bouillon, on the appointed day. In June, 1097, the Crusaders took Nicæa, the capital of the Turks, who then established their capital at Cogni (*Iconium*). In 1098 they took Edessa and besieged Antioch, of which John IV. was Patriarch. There, in the Church of St. Peter, was said to have been discovered the lance which pierced our Saviour's side. After a siege of seven months

Antioch was betrayed to them, and made a Principality for Bohemund, son of the famous Robert Guiscard, who bound himself by an oath to the Emperor that the Patriarch should be chosen not from the Latin, but the Greek, Church. This agreement the Latins soon forgot[a]; in two years John IV. had to give place to Adhimer, bishop of Puy, and John IV. died in exile at Constantinople.

On July 15, 1099, Jersusalem, after a terrible slaughter of the Turks, was taken by the Crusaders. It was Friday, and three o'clock in the afternoon, the day and time of the Saviour's Crucifixion. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was established under Godfrey de Bouillon, who refused to wear a crown of gold where the Saviour had worn the Crown of Thorns. Simeon, the Patriarch, dying a few days afterwards, Pope Paschal II. appointed a Latin Patriarch, Daimbert, Archbishop of Pisa. The First Crusade was the only one attended with any measure of success, and the Latin Kingdom comprised little more than Jerusalem and Jaffa (*Joppa*), and a few neighbouring towns; it was from the first weak, containing the seeds of its dissolution, its main bulwark being the Military Orders appointed during the First Crusade, of whom the principal were the Knights Templars, as guardians of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Knights Hospitallers, to protect pilgrims visiting the Holy City.

Godfrey died within a year of his appointment. The other Kings of Jerusalem were; Godfrey's brother Baldwin I. (1100—1118); Baldwin II. (1118—1131); Fulk of Anjou (1131—1144); Baldwin III. (1144—1162); Almeric (1162—1173); Baldwin IV. (1173—1186); Guy de Lusignan (1186—1187).

[a] "Hoc pacti conventi caput—minimè observatum fuit ab Latinis." Le Quien, III. 787.

Second Crusade. The Mahometans having in 1146 captured Edessa, a Second Crusade was preached by St. Bernard, the celebrated Abbot of Clairvaux, but was attended with nothing but disaster.

In 1163 the Latins suffered a disastrous defeat from Noureddin Sultan of Aleppo, one of whose Generals was the famous Saladin, who, A.D. 1173, suppressed the Fatimite Caliphate and made himself master of Egypt, and on the death, in 1173, of Noureddin, of Syria.

In 1187 Saladin defeated Guy de Lusignan in the battle of Tiberias; and in October of the same year took Jerusalem, thus putting an end to the Latin Kingdom, after it had lasted eighty-seven years.

The Third Crusade, for the recovery of Jerusalem, was preached in 1189, and started for the Holy Land under Frederic Barbarossa, Emperor of Germany. In 1190 Barbarossa was drowned in the river Cnidus in Cilicia; in 1191 Richard Cœur de Lion of England joined the Crusade. On his outward voyage Richard took Cyprus, which now became a Latin Kingdom under Guy de Lusignan, the late King of Jerusalem, with a Latin Archbishop at Nicosia.

In 1191, after a siege of two years, the Crusaders recovered Acre, which, after the battle of Tiberias, had yielded to Saladin, and Acre became (1191—1291) the residence of the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem.

The other Crusading leaders, jealous of Richard and quarrelling with him and amongst themselves, returned home, Philip Augustus to France, and Leopold to Austria. Richard, continuing longer in Palestine, defeated Saladin in several battles, capturing Jaffa (*Joppa*) and Cæsarea. But he in vain demanded of Saladin the restitution of Palestine and the Holy Cross; all that he

could obtain for the Christians was a truce for three years and eight months; security for pilgrims, and access, without payment or tribute, to the Holy Sepulchre.

In 1193 Saladin died.

After the Third Crusade the state of Palestine grew even worse than before. In 1197 the truce with Saladin expired, and in that year Jaffa was taken by Saladin's brother Saphadim, 10,000 Christians being put to death. The Christians began to experience treachery in their camp; the Templars were accused of holding treasonable correspondence with the Mahometans, who made many converts from their Order.

At the time that the Fourth Crusade was undertaken, the sees of Constantinople and Rome were well-nigh on an equality, the Patriarch of Constantinople being the Œcumenical Patriarch. In 1198 Innocent III. was consecrated Pope (1198—1216), under whom the Papal see advanced far beyond anything claimed for it by the Forged Decretals; Innocent declared that a Pope is as superior to a king as the sun is to the moon; ("Quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter Pontifices et reges, differentia").

The Fourth Crusade was preached by Fulk, the Parish Priest of Neuilly, near Paris, and was undertaken at the instance of Pope Innocent. The Greek Church could now no longer doubt that at Rome the Crusades had a further object than the defence of the Holy Land, viz., the aggrandisement of the Roman see. "Tempus advenisse videtis," Innocent said, "in quo, destructis vitulis aureis, Israel vertatur ad Judam et ad Hierosolumam Samaria convertatur." In 1199 John X. (*Camateros*), Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote to him as "dilecto fratri nostro" (another sign that Communion was not entirely broken

off); he said, "pro miro habeo quomodo universalem Romanorum vocasti Ecclesiam," a title which, he humbly said, belonged to the Patriarchate of Jerusalem. Urgent appeals for help being made by the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, the Fourth Crusade to the Holy Land was organized by Innocent; but it degenerated into a war for the conquest of the Eastern Empire, and the Crusaders' flag waved not over Jerusalem but over Constantinople. But we anticipate.

The Crusaders, numbering 200,000, were conveyed in Venetian vessels, and in October, 1202, arrived at Venice. Suddenly a change of plan was determined on, and they were persuaded by the blind old Doge Enrico Dandolo, notwithstanding the threats of Pope Innocent, to assist him in recovering Zara in Dalmatia, which had been seized by the King of Hungary.

Zara having been captured after a siege of six days, the Crusade was again diverted from its purpose. The Emperor Isaac Angelus II. (1185—1195) had been blinded and deposed, and, together with his young son Alexius, imprisoned by his brother, who then usurped the throne as Alexius III. (1195—1203). The young Alexius contriving to escape from prison succeeded, by profuse promises, in persuading the Crusaders to aid him in the restoration of his father. In the summer of 1203 they, under the ban of the Pope, appeared before Constantinople, and in July entered the city in triumph, the usurping Emperor having fled with whatever jewels and treasures he could lay hands on, and leaving the city to take care of itself. The old Emperor was then restored, his son being crowned as his colleague under the title of Alexius IV.

The young Emperor was an idle and dissipated tyrant,

who showed himself as incapable as his father and uncle, and the misfortunes of the people were aggravated by a fire which ravaged Constantinople. To secure the favour of the Crusaders, whose further help was needed to keep him on his insecure throne, Alexius induced his father to acknowledge the Pope's supremacy; but he was regarded as a traitor by Greeks, and, by Greeks and Latins alike, with contempt. The indignation of the Greeks was further increased when he proceeded to strip the Cathedral, the churches, and the monasteries, of their gold and silver, for payment to the Crusaders. The people rose in rebellion and found a leader in Alexius Ducas (Murtzuphlus; *beetle-browed*); the old Emperor died of fright; Alexius IV., under assurance that he was being conducted into a place of safety, was imprisoned, and strangled by Murtzuphlus, who then ascended the throne as Alexius V.

The Crusaders, finding that the pecuniary arrangement stipulated with the young Alexius was not carried out, declared war against the Eastern Empire, and in April, 1204, attacked Constantinople. Murtzuphlus, not trusting his subjects, fled. The Patriarch, John Camateros, and the Greek clergy stood in the gap and rallied the people; and at their instance Theodore Lascaris, son-in-law of Alexius III., was elected Emperor; but he found it necessary to fly to Nicæa. The so-called champions of the Cross were victorius, and never was victory more cruelly abused. In vain the unhappy citizens implored the mercy of their victors; no restraint was practised, no mercy for age or sex was shown, and 2,000 Greeks were ruthlessly murdered. Though it was Holy Week, plunder and sacrilege prevailed everywhere; priests were maltreated; the churches profaned with sacrilegious cere-

monies; the Greek ritual ridiculed; the altar-vessels turned into drinking-cups for drunken orgies. An abandoned female, seated in shameless dress on the Patriarchal throne, sang ribald songs, or danced before the very altar of St. Sophia's. Pictures of the Saviour and the Saints were destroyed or defaced; and, not to mention other ornaments and sacred treasures which were carried off in carts driven through the churches, there were the picture of the Virgin, said to have been painted by St. Luke, and the Crown of Thorns, for the reception of which the Sainte Chapelle at Paris was built by St. Louis. In the spoil taken from Constantinople were the bronze horses which adorn the piazza of San Marco at Venice.

Murtzuphlus, taken prisoner and sentenced to death for the murder of Alexius IV., was hurled headlong from the Theodosian column. A Latin Emperor, Baldwin, Count of Flanders, elected by the Franks, was seated on the throne of the Eastern Cæsars (1204—1205); a subdeacon, Thomaso Morosini, elected by the Venetians, on the throne of the Eastern Patriarch. Morosini was at the time in Rome; the Pope sanctioned the election, and took the intruder under his special patronage; Innocent violated every canon of the Catholic Church, which regulates the election and deposition of bishops, and forbids two bishops of the same city; with his own hands he ordained him deacon, and within a week presbyter and bishop, and invested him with the Pall; only insisting that he should acknowledge his supremacy. The rightful Patriarch, John Camateros, stripped of his Patriarchal robes, and seated upon an ass, was driven from the city.

It is only just to Pope Innocent to say, that he endeavoured to prevent the Fourth Crusade from deviating from its proper purpose; yet he afterwards took it under

his ægis, and, as we have seen, consecrated a Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, when the lawful Patriarch was still living. One effect of the Fourth Crusade was to intensify the bitter feeling between the two Churches, the Greeks spurning the Latins as "dogs." "How is it possible," Innocent wrote, "that the Greeks should ever return to unity, when they have been treated in such a manner that they deservedly abhor the Latins worse than dogs?" ("merito abhorrescant plus quam canes"). Innocent himself spoke of the Crusaders; "nec religioni nec ætati nec sexui pepercerunt; sed fornicationes, adulteria, et incestus in oculis omnium exercentes, non solum maritas at virgines Deo dicatas exposuerunt spurcitiis garcionum."

In 1215 Innocent assembled the Fourth Lateran Council, for the recovery, as stated in his Bull, of the Holy Land, and the reformation of the Church. It was attended by delegates of the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and by two rival claimants of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople. Nothing of consequence to the Greek Church was effected. On the death of Morosini in 1211, two rival candidates presented themselves, and such violent quarrels took place amongst the Latins, that (but not till the see had been vacant four years) Innocent, at the Lateran Council, put both aside and appointed Gervasius (1215—1220).

In the Fifth Crusade Frederic II. of Germany was the principal actor. His life is described very differently by Guelphs and Ghibellines; but, so gifted was he with varied accomplishments of mind and body, that he was styled "the Wonder of the World;" yet he was three times excommunicated by Pope Gregory IX.; once when he was prevented by political exigencies from fulfilling his vow of going on a Crusade; the second time because

he went without receiving absolution. In 1229 he arrived in Palestine, and made with the Sultan Kamel a truce for ten years, by which not only Jerusalem, but Lydda, Bethlehem, Nazareth, Tyre, and Sidon, were restored to the Christians; and he returned to Europe to find himself a third time excommunicated by the Pope. "What means this arrogant and daring Pope" ("quo spiritu vel ausu temerario"), asked Louis IX., the saintly King of France (1226—1270), "to disinherit a King who has no equal in Christendom?"

The sixth was an English Crusade under Richard, Earl of Cornwall, and William Longsword, by whom the remainder of Palestine was once again recovered to Christianity.

At the time when the strength of Christendom was divided; when the East was broken up into two rival Empires; when the West was distracted by the quarrels between the Emperor Frederic II. and Pope Innocent IV. (1243 — 1254), whom the English Grosteste, the famous bishop of Lincoln, branded as Antichrist; it was impossible for the Christians of Palestine to stand alone against the infidels. Peace was broken in 1243 by the irruption of barbarous hordes of Mahometan Corasmians, who, driven from Persia by the Moguls, a tribe as barbarous as themselves, attacked Jerusalem. The Holy City was abandoned by its garrison; the Grandmasters of the Templars and Hospitallers were slain, and the two Orders almost annihilated; the Christian churches and the Holy Sepulchre were violated; and thousands of pilgrims put to a cruel and indiscriminate slaughter, surpassing anything that had been suffered from Saracens or Turks. Thus the Holy City was again taken by Mahometans, and another Crusade was necessary.

The Seventh Crusade (1245 — 1254) was conducted by St. Louis of France, but nothing was effected.

In 1268 Antioch was taken by the Saracens, and in July, 1270, St. Louis started on the Eighth Crusade, to fall in August a victim to the plague at Tunis.

In the same year Prince Edward of England joined the Crusade, but returned, in 1274, to England as King Edward I.

Acre, which the Crusaders considered "the key of the East," was now the sole possession left to the Christians. It is described as having become a sink of iniquity. It was said to contain at one and the same time 16,000 prostitutes, whilst the clergy and monks were men of notoriously infamous lives; so that it was thought that it would be better in the hands of Mahometans, than continue to disgrace the Christian name. In 1291 Acre fell, the Patriarch effecting his escape.

There are two points of view, an Eastern and a Western, from which the Crusades must be regarded. They professed to be Holy Wars, to deliver the Holy Land from the oppression of the Turks; but they were undertaken without any idea of bringing the Gospel home to the Mahometans. Some of them were mere filibustering expeditions of undisciplined troops, the scum of the population of Europe, under incompetent leaders; and their evil living led the Mahometans to scorn the Christian faith. In the East they were from the first, both by the Emperors and people, viewed with suspicion; and, as events proved, the Latins hated the Greeks worse than they did the Turks. There is no reason to doubt that the Popes started them with the best of motives; but, says Mr. Bryce[b], Rome was "probably the only com-

[b] *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 281.

munity in Europe who sent no recruits to the armies of the Cross;" he might have added, or received any benefit from the Crusades. To the Popedom and the Roman Church they were a deeply politic and successful movement. It could scarcely have been otherwise. A new mode of salvation, of which the Pope was the fountain, and of which people of all classes availed themselves, was invented. The Pope was placed on a higher pinnacle than earthly Kings and potentates. He could impose a Crusade for their souls' good on Kings and Emperors; and through him the greatest criminals could obtain forgiveness of their sins, by taking the Cross of a Crusader.

Far otherwise was it with the Greek Church, to which the Crusades were an unparalleled calamity. The Crusaders carried on the wars like savages, and from fighting against Turks turned to fighting against the Eastern Christians. The Crusades degenerated into a Latinizing movement; owing to them, the long contest for supremacy between the Popes and the Patriarchs of Constantinople resulted in favour of the former; after the sacking of Constantinople by the Crusaders its ultimate fate was certain; it was the Fourth Crusade and the action of Pope Innocent that paved the way for the victory of the Turks in 1453, and the downfall of the Greek Church.

But the Crusaders were far from overwhelming the whole Eastern Empire; rival Greek Empires were established at Nicæa, Epirus, and Trebizond; the last of which outlived the restored Greek Empire at Constantinople.

It is with the first of these, of which Theodore Lascaris was appointed Emperor, that we are chiefly con-

cerned. Fortunately for Lascaris, the violence of Pelagius, the Papal legate, and his persecution of those of the Orthodox Church who refused to recognize the Pope's supremacy, so disgusted the Greeks at Constantinople that, whatever of the aristocracy and wealth remained there, as well as the most distinguished of the clergy, fled to Nicæa. The Patriarch, John Camateros, declining, Michael Autorianus was appointed Patriarch (1206—1212).

Pope Innocent wrote to Theodore that "the Greek Church had rent asunder the seamless yoke of Christ," and that God had employed the Latins to punish their iniquity; and, denying his title of Emperor, required him to acknowledge himself the vassal of the Latin Empire, and assume the garb of a Crusader.

Theodore was succeeded by his son-in-law, John III., (*Ducas Vatatzes*, 1222 — 1254)[c]. Notwithstanding the Pope's rebuff, Vatatzes, in the hope of recovering the lost possessions of the Eastern Empire, reopened negotiations, through the Patriarch Germanus III.[d], with Pope Gregory IX., for the re-union of the Churches. The Pope sent, in 1232, to Nicæa two Dominican and two Franciscan monks; and a conference was held in the Imperial Palace, and adjourned to Nymphæum. Greeks and Latins brought forward mutual charges and accusations; the Latins complained of the Greeks condemning their azyms; of their purifying their altars after Latin celebrations; of their re-baptizing Latins; and of the erasure of the Pope's name from their Diptychs. The Patriarch replied with a counter accusation, viz., the desecration

[c] "Vir magno ingenio animique constantiâ et morum gravitate insignis."
[d] "Vir prudens et doctrinâ et vitæ probitate insignis."

by the Latins of Greek Churches, altars, and vessels, in the Fourth Crusade. The charge of erasing the Pope's name the Patriarch met with the question, "Why has the Pope erased mine?"

The two principal points discussed were the azyms and the Filioque. The Emperor, overlooking the fact that he would have to reckon with the Greek Church, which has always had a fossilised objection to compromises, proposed a *via media.* This the Papal legates met with a *non possumus.* No agreement was arrived at, and the legates returned to Rome after having had a very pleasant time at Constantinople, and being charmed with the hospitality of the Emperor.

Other attempts at re-union were made by Vatatzes, but all on the condition imposed by the Emperor, that the Latin Empire should be put an end to, and the Greek Patriarchs, except the Patriarch of Antioch, who might continue till his death, be restored.

Theodore II. (*Lascaris*, 1254—1259), the son and successor of Vatatzes, having at the age of 36 retired into a monastery for the sake of prosecuting his studies, was succeeded by his son, John IV. (1259—1261), a boy eight years of age, under the guardianship of the Patriarch Arsenius, the successor of Germanus, a man incapable of coping with the difficulties which now beset the Empire at Nicæa. The events which follow do not reflect credit on the Greek Church at this period. Michael Palæologus, an able General, but an unprincipled demagogue, contrived to get the bishops on his side, and to be elected joint-Emperor. Arsenius resigning the Patriarchate rather than perform the coronation, the ceremony was performed by Nicephorus II. (1260—1261), who was elected in his place.

The Latin Empire of Romania, as it was called, was feeble from the first, and was now falling to decay. Baldwin I. was succeeded by his brother Henry of Flanders (1205—1216), and he, in default of male heirs, by Peter of Courtney (1217—1219), who married his sister Yolande, by whom he became the father of the last Latin Emperor, Baldwin II., who married the daughter of Charles of Anjou. The marriage was of importance, for Charles, the favourite of the French Popes, pulled the wires by which the puppet-Emperor Michael Palæologus was made to obey their behests. To such a miserable plight was Baldwin reduced that, after begging succour against Ducas Vatatzes from the Courts of Europe, he was driven to pawn the relics of the Churches, and to tear off the copper roof of his palace to sell to the Venetians, with whom he left his son in pawn.

Nor was the state of the Latin Patriarchate any better. Between Morosini the first and Pantaleon the last Latin Patriarch four others intervened. We have seen how, in consequence of the violent quarrels which ensued on the death of Morosini, Pope Innocent at the Lateran Council set aside both candidates, and himself appointed Gervasius. On the death of Gervasius, another quarrel occurred [e], and Pope Honorius III. appointed Matthias (1221—1226) bishop of Aquila. The conduct of Matthias was so scandalous ("factus est multis offendiculum"), as to call down a reproof from Honorius. Simeon, the next Patriarch (1226—1233), was appointed by Pope Gregory IX., under similar circumstances to those which led to the appointment of Gervasius. The Latin Patriarchate

[e] "Clerus Constantinopolitanus consentire non potuit." Le Quien, I. 801.

grew weaker and weaker, till Nicolas (1235—1251) complained that his suffragans had dwindled down from thirty to three, and that he himself had not enough to live upon[f]. During the Patriarchate of Pantaleon, Alexander IV. was Pope; Italy was too distracted with the strifes of the Guelphs and Ghibellines for him to concern himself in the East; and when the Latin Empire fell, Pantaleon fled to Rome.

Michael Palæologus, having defeated in battle Baldwin and his allies, entered Constantinople in triumph on August 14, 1261; and was a second time crowned Emperor by the restored Patriarch Arsenius; the Latins were expelled, and Baldwin accompanied Pantaleon in his flight to Rome. Thus the Latin Empire of Romania having lasted 57 years (1204—1261) came to an end, and the Greek Empire, weakened and crippled by the Crusades, was re-established. Michael soon threw off all disguise, and, having blinded the boy-Emperor John and cast him into a dungeon for the rest of his days, reigned as sole Emperor (1261—1282). Thus was founded the last and most ignoble dynasty of the Eastern Empire; the Palæologi boasted the proud title of Roman, and styled themselves Emperors of the Romans.

The closing years of the Eastern Empire under the Palæologi were overclouded with internal dissensions, with the advance of the Ottomans, and the servile cringing of the Palæologi to the Popes, in which last respect they invariably found themselves at enmity with the Greek Church. They used for their own purpose, and out-manœuvred, the Popes; when they were in trouble they sought Western help, which could only be obtained

[f] "Nec sibi remansit unde valeat sustentari." Le Quien, III. 807.

by hypocritical professions of obedience to the Popes; when the trouble was past, and they found themselves in collision with their Orthodox subjects, they as eagerly rejected, as before they courted, the alliance.

The Orthodox Church was now again restored, and its ascendency was marked by, if possible, greater hatred of the Latins. But it had degenerated and lost its influence. It was eminently conservative and orthodox, well versed in ecclesiastical formulas and dogmas, enthusiastic in defence of their Church against the Popes and, when its Orthodoxy was endangered, against the Emperors; to whom, however, when anything else was concerned, they were ready to yield a blind obedience. It concerned itself but little with the mal-administration of the civil government, with the evils of which the clergy were often tainted; avarice and simony were rife; and no rank of society exerted its influence to avert the calamities which were soon to overwhelm the Eastern Empire and the Greek Church.

For Michael's last act of, at least intentional, murder, though most of the prelates tried to screen him, he was excommunicated by the uncompromising Patriarch, who was consequently deposed and banished to Proconnesus, an obsequious Synod ratifying the proceeding. Germanus III., Metropolitan of Hadrianople, was, after it had been vacant a year, appointed to the Patriarchate, but so strong was the feeling against this translation of a bishop, that in the same year (1266) he resigned, and Joseph, the Emperor's confessor, was appointed, and from him Michael received absolution. But thus a long-standing schism was caused between the followers of Arsenius and those of Joseph.

Meanwhile the usurper Michael—smarting under the

excommunication of the lawful Patriarch, apprehensive of the vengeance of the people, and threatened by Charles of Anjou[g], thought it expedient to have the Pope for his friend. James Pantaleon, the son of a French cobbler, was at the time Pope as Urban IV. (1261—1264). That he had been the schismatical Patriarch at Jerusalem under the Latin Empire, Michael condoned.

Urban wrote to him, rejoicing that God had put it into the heart of so great a Prince (he does not recognize him as Emperor) to bring back the Greek Church to the Church of Rome, the daughter to the mother, the member to the head; he told him that all the evils which beset the Eastern Church were owing to its disobedience to Rome; that if he would return to allegiance he would give him the help required to keep him on his unstable throne. He sent to Constantinople two Franciscan monks to arrange the terms of union; Michael told them that he had been fully instructed in the Latin faith by the Bishop of Ancona, that he found the two Churches in harmony, and that he would do all in his power to bring the Greek Church under obedience to the Pope. Further negotiations were interrupted by the Pope's death.

Michael renewed his application to Urban's successor, another Frenchman, Clement IV. (1264—1268). Clement, well knowing the dangers which beset Michael from Charles of Anjou, and believing that he was ready to accept anything that he demanded, thought, "by virtue of the power enjoyed by the Popes of Rome over the whole Catholic Church," to impose on the Greek Church a new creed, based on no councils, dealing, amongst other matters, with the double Procession and the Azyms. The

[g] "Pæne ad desperationem compulsus." Niceph. V. 1, 4.

Greek Church never thought of allowing the Pope's interference; still the Emperor continued the negotiations to the death of Clement.

The next Pope, Gregory X. (1271—1275), a man of gentler character than his two predecessors, was summoned from the Holy Land to fill the Papal throne. Having been an eye-witness of the calamities of the Christians in the East, he had in view the great object of the deliverance of the Holy Land; he desired the union of the Churches; but at the same time he insisted on the creed of his predecessor, and that Michael should hold a council at Constantinople to promote the union. The council was accordingly held, and the Emperor, to enforce the terms of union, resorted to cruel persecution; the Greek bishops were compelled to vote as the Emperor bade them; many noble families, rather than being guilty of apostacy, emigrated to Thessaly and Trebizond; two of the strongest opponents being the Patriarch Joseph, whom Michael had before found a pliant tool, and John Beccus or Veccus, the Keeper of the Records (*χαρτοφύλαξ*), the latter of whom was imprisoned.

In May, 1274, the Second council of Lyons was held, its chief objects being a Crusade to the Holy Land, the union of the Churches, and the reformation of manners. It was presided over by Pope Gregory X., and was attended by some 500 Latin bishops, 14 Cardinals, 70 Abbots, a large number of other Church dignitaries, and the Latin Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch.

On June 24 the Greek envoys, and amongst them the ex-Patriarch Germanus, some nobles, and some Greek bishops, who had submitted to the Emperor's will at the council of Constantinople, arrived, conveying the articles of union sent by the Emperor. An edict from Michael

was read, allowing the Roman Primacy, Purgatory, and Transubstantiation; as also a letter, requesting union, from 35 Greek bishops whom the Emperor had cajoled into compliance. The Emperor desired that the Greek Church might have the liberty of using the Nicene Creed, as it existed before the schism, and its other rites "qui non sunt contra supradictam fidem;" i.e. the creed of Clement IV.

The Pope took no notice of the Emperor's request, and the first canon of the council proclaimed; "We profess that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son; this is the teaching of the holy Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all the faithful, and is the true and unchangeable teaching alike of Latins and Greeks." The Imperial envoys conceded everything; the Pope celebrated Mass in St. John's Church, and after the Gospel and Epistle had been read in Latin and Greek, the Nicene Creed with the Filioque was repeated in Latin by the Latins, and thrice repeated by the Greeks in Greek.

On the return of the envoys the greatest indignation was excited at Constantinople, and the Emperor was the object of hatred and contempt to his subjects. But in the meantime the imprisoned Veccus had under strong pressure been brought to acknowledge the Papal claims, and, Joseph being deposed, Veccus was intruded into the Patriarchate as John XI.; and by him and his few followers the Pope was declared to be "Supreme Pontiff of the Apostolic Church, and Œcumenical Pope."

By a series of intrigues Michael had gained what he wanted, and, through submission to the Pope, a war with his enemy, Charles of Anjou, was averted, but it was at the cost of troubles at home, by which his throne

was constantly imperilled. But as to the Filioque all parties were agreed, and even Michael stood out against it; Pope Nicholas III. (1277—1280), whom Dante places amongst simoniacs suffering the torments of hell, sent four Nuncios to Constantinople to complete the union; but before they arrived, Veccus was deposed for upholding the double Procession, and Michael with difficulty withheld the Greek clergy from rising in rebellion.

On March 30, 1282, occurred the massacre known as the Sicilian Vespers, when the hated Angevin dynasty in Sicily came to an end. The sword of Charles of Anjou no longer hanging over his head, Michael began to breathe the air of freedom; Pope Martin IV. (1281—1285), a Frenchman who had been the slave of Charles, saw how the whole transaction was a political movement, and that the Popes had been hoodwinked by the Emperor; and one of his first acts was to excommunicate Michael, Michael retaliating by expunging the Pope's name from the public service-books.

In December, 1282, Michael died, repudiated by the Greek, and excommunicated by the Roman, Church; and was succeeded by his son Andronicus II. (*the Elder*, 1282—1328). The hostility of the Greeks to the union now broke out with even greater violence than before; and so strong was the feeling against Michael, that his funeral was conducted without the usual honours, and his wife Theodora was compelled to abjure the union.

In January, 1283, the Cathedral of St. Sophia, in which the Creed with the double Procession had been recited, underwent purification, and a solemn recantation was celebrated. Veccus was left to spend the last fourteen years of his life in a monastery; the Patriarch Arsenius having died in 1274, Joseph was restored; and after his

death in the same year (1283), Gregory III., who as a native of Cyprus and born of Latin parents had supported the union, but now joined the Orthodox Church, was re-appointed Patriarch; but in 1289 he was deposed for holding the Latin doctrine on the Procession.

In the reign of Andronicus the Elder, the dynasty of Seljuk Turks came to an end, and the Ottoman Turks enter the page of history. In 1299, Othman (1299—1326), a mere freebooter and soldier of fortune, crossed the Asiatic frontier of the Roman Empire with 400 Mahometan families, which swelled into the great Ottoman Empire.

About 1312 the fall of six out of the Seven Churches of Asia was effected by two of Othman's Generals, Sarukhan and Aidin. No stronger evidence of the truth of prophecy can be found than in the fall of the Seven Churches.

Of the Seven Churches addressed by St. John, to two only, Smyrna and Philadelphia, were promises made without threat or warning. They alone of the Seven stand erect amidst the surrounding ruins; of them alone the Candlestick has not been removed. The most flourishing in the present day is Smyrna, which is the seat of a Metropolitan, where an English Church was consecrated in the present year[h]. Philadelphia, called by the Turks Ali-Shahir (*the fair city*), being on the road traversed by the Persian caravans, enjoys a considerable trade; and Sir Paul Ricaud, who was British Consul at Smyrna about 1660, wrote in his *Present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, that it contained twelve

[h] Statistics which we have before us show that whilst Smyrna contained in 1830, 80,000 Turks and 20,000 Christians, in thirty years the former decreased to 41,000, whilst the Christians increased to 75,000 souls.

Churches, although alas! that of St. John had been converted into a dunghill.

But of the other five the Candlestick has been removed, and most of them are a mere heap of ruins, eluding the search of travellers. Philadelphia alone for a time survived the fall of its sister Churches[i]; but it too fell under the arms of the Emir Murad I. (1360—1389), or it may be the Sultan Bajazet I. (1389—1402).

At the death of the elder Andronicus, the Eastern Empire was only two-thirds of the size that it had been at his accession. In the reign of Andronicus the Younger (1328—1341), it extended little beyond the walls of Constantinople on the Western, and Chalcedon on the Asiatic, side of the Bosphorus. In 1330, Orkhan took Nicæa and threw off the nominal subjection to the Sultan of Cogni; and he is considered the real founder of the Ottoman Empire, of which he made Prusa the capital.

From the time of Michael Palæologus to the death of Andronicus the Elder, there had been little intercourse between the Greek and Roman Churches. In 1305 commenced the period known as the Babylonish Captivity, when the Popes resided not at Rome, but at Avignon. The great Roman Catholic poet Petrarch, who passed many years of his life at the time in, and near, that city, compares the Papal Court at that time to the Babylon of the Apocalypse. The period was ushered in by one of the blackest crimes recorded in history, the cruel extermination (1306—1314) of the Knights Templars. It is difficult to determine whether Pope Clement V. is to be more pitied or despised. In 1310, the Knights Hospitallers, under their Grand-Master Foulkes de Villaret, conquered

[i] "Dextrâ ipsâ Dei supernè adjuvante propter insignem virtutem Theolepti" (the bishop of the see). Niceph. VII. 1, 3.

Rhodes, and set up an independent Kingdom, which was long the bulwark of Christian Europe against the Ottomans. The Templars fared far differently. Their wealth excited the avarice of Philippe le Bel, King of France and Navarre, and he found a ready tool in the Archbishop of Bordeaux, who, by his orders, became Pope as Clement V. (1305—April 20, 1314). He had previously bound the Archbishop with conditions, one of which was that Philippe should for five years be paid the tithes of the Gallican Clergy; whilst the last condition was kept unrevealed to him. To these shameful terms the weak Archbishop acceded; at Lyons he was consecrated Pope; and removed the Papal Court to Avignon, a town in Provence where the Popes were for nearly seventy years the tools of the French Kings.

The unrevealed condition was the massacre and extermination of the Templars, which, as they were subject only to the Pope, could only be effected with the Pope's concurrence. Doubtless the Pope was horrified when the condition was divulged to him; but he yielded. Inveigled into France, they were sentenced by the Inquisition to torture, to make them confess crimes which they did not, and which it was impossible they could, commit. Some in their agony yielded, and afterwards retracting their confession were burnt alive. The Order was suppressed at the Council of Lyons, presided over by the Pope, A.D. 1312, their property confiscated, and 15,000 turned adrift on the world. Their Grand-Master, Jacques du Molay, was burnt alive over a slow fire at Paris, protesting his innocence, and citing Pope and King to meet him before the judgment-seat of God; the one within forty days, the other in less than a year. On the fortieth day after (April 20), Pope Clement died;

and in the following November, Philippe, at the age of forty-five, died from a fall from his horse.

The younger Andronicus had married a Roman Catholic wife, Anne of Savoy, and his marriage inclined him favourably to the Roman Church. John Aprenus was at the time Patriarch of Constantinople (1333—1347). The Emperor considering him and the other Greek bishops too ignorant to advise him [k], consulted a layman, the historian Nicephorus, with the result that he sent to Pope John XXII. (1316—1334), at Avignon, to seek his aid against the advancing Turks.

The Pope despatched to Constantinople two bishops, to remind the Emperor of the great evils which since the schism had befallen the Greeks, and of the great advantages to them of re-union, through acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope and the faith of the Roman Church. But the Greeks would have nothing to do with them. They were fully convinced of the rightfulness of their own Church; they remembered the creed of Clement IV., and how the Popes had served the Emperor Michael. They may well have imagined, if the Popes at Rome could do so little for them, they could do still less at Avignon. The wily Greeks demanded that the Popes should first give them the help asked for, as a proof of the advantage to be derived from a Roman alliance.

Again, in 1339, Andronicus opened negotiations for assistance on the basis of re-union, after a General Council should have arranged the points of difference between the Churches; and he selected as envoy, Barlaam, a monk of St. Saviour's at Constantinople, who had been educated in the Latin Church, but had been outwardly

[k] "Suo episcopos maximam partem indoctissimos." Niceph. X. 8.

brought over to his side by Andronicus. But Barlaam was throughout the proceedings more a Roman than a Greek; he was, moreover, almost entirely ignorant of the Greek language[l].

Barlaam represented to Pope Benedict XII. (1334—1342) that the Emperor desired union, but that he must consult his own dignity and the prejudices of his people; that the Greek Church reverenced six General Councils[m], but reprobated the council of Lyons. He proposed that a Latin legate should be sent to Constantinople, to prepare for a council which the Greek Patriarchs should attend. The Greeks, he said, had been alienated by a long series of wrongs, and needed to be reconciled by some act of love, and some effectual succour against the Turks, the common enemies of the Christian name; and the legate must be accompanied, or preceded, by an army of Franks to expel the infidels.

The Pope objected to a council on the ground that the Procession had been decided by the holy Fathers and the great Councils. He insisted upon unconditional surrender, and he returned an offensive reply with regard to "the persons who style themselves the Patriarchs of the Eastern Church." This attempt, therefore, was as futile as the others had been; the plain truth being that the Pope, himself an exile at Avignon, had not the power of meeting the proposals of the Emperor.

Barlaam, when on a visit to Mount Athos, came in contact with the Hesychasts (ἡσυχία); *Quietists;* a school which had lately sprung up in that monastery. They held the notion that the soul had its seat in the umbilical region (whence they were called ὀμφαλόψυχοι), by intent

[l] He knew it only "mediocriter et extremo quod aiunt digito." Niceph. XI. 10, 1.

[m] "Sexies factum est Concilium Generale."

contemplation of which they could, after long abstinence, discern the Light which appeared to the Apostles on Mount Tabor. This idea, which was supported by Gregory Palamas, afterwards Archbishop of Thessalonica, Barlaam ridiculed, and a sharp controversy, which lasted five years, ended at a council at Constantinople in favour of the Hesychasts, and in the establishment of the doctrine of the Uncreated Light of Mount Tabor. Barlaam returned to the Latin Church, and became a bishop in his native country, Calabria.

Andronicus the younger was succeeded by his son, John V. (1341—1391), a boy 9 years of age, under the guardianship of his mother, Anne of Savoy; John Cantacuzene being at first Prime Minister, and afterwards (1347—1354) joint-Emperor, if Empire that could be called which extended but little beyond the walls of Constantinople. Nothing could more plainly show the degradation of the Eastern Empire at this time, than the marriage, in 1347, of Cantacuzene's daughter with the Turkish Emir Orkhan; whilst in the same year the young Emperor, at the time 15 years of age, married Helena, another of Cantacuzene's daughters; so that now one Emperor was father-in-law, and another Emperor brother-in-law of the Mahometan Emir. But the marriage of Cantacuzene's daughter with the Emir did not, as he expected it would, ward off the danger of the Turks; and in 1348, Cantacuzene opened negotiations for a council with Pope Clement VI. (1342—1352). Clement was in favour of a council, and sent from Avignon two bishops to Constantinople. Cantacuzene disclaimed the action of Michael Palæologus; imputed the schism to the pride and overbearing conduct of the Latins; and declared that the Greeks would never be bound by any-

thing short of a free and universal council. The Pope accepted the conditions; there was nothing, he said, he desired more than the union of the Churches; but the death of the Pope and the compulsory abdication, two years afterwards, of Cantacuzene, to end his days as a monk on Mount Athos, put an end to negotiations.

At that time Slavic Servia, under its Tsar, Stephen Dushan (1331—1355), was at the height of its power; it had wrested from the Eastern Empire its Thracian, Macedonian, Albanian, and Greek provinces, and it appeared that Constantinople would become the capital of his Tsardom. But after his time Servia rapidly fell; in 1356 (the year following his death) the Turks, by the capture of Gallipoli, gained their first footing in Europe; in 1361, the Emir Murad or Amurath I. made it his European capital; and Constantinople was now at the mercy, not of the Servians, but the Mahometans. The alarmed Emperor, by the advice of Anne of Savoy, determined to seek the assistance of the Pope, and in October, 1379, he in person visited Rome, whither the Papal chair had in 1376 been brought from Avignon.

Urban VI. (1378—1389) was Pope. On the death of Gregory X. (1371—1378), the Romans, wearied out with the succession of French Popes, clamoured for an Italian Pope; but all the Cardinals appointed during the residence at Avignon, except two who were unsuitable, being Frenchmen, the choice fell on the Cardinal Bishop of Bari, who took the title of Urban VI.

At Rome the Emperor met with a magnificent reception; and, says Gibbon [n], he was profuse in empty sounds and formal submission. On the Sunday follow-

[n] XII. 75.

ing his arrival, having in St. Peter's recited the creed of Clement IV., and kissed the Pope's foot, he did homage and acknowledged the Pope's supremacy; and when the service was concluded, he held the bridle of the Pope's mule.

But it was the act of the Emperor alone. The Greeks had before despised him for his profligacy; they doubly despised him, now that he was the Pope's vassal. His subservience to the Pope profited him nothing; help against the Turks was not forthcoming; and on his homeward journey he was arrested for debt by money-lenders at Venice.

In 1389, the Emir Murad gained the great victory of Kossova, in Servia, over the allied armies of Servia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, and Wallachia; Servia now lost its independence; and Murad died, stabbed to the heart by a Servian Noble.

Hitherto the Ottoman Emperors had been contented with the lower title of Emir; Murad's son and successor, Bajazet I. (*the Lightning*), was the first to assume the higher title of Sultan.

The victory of Kossova left Bajazet a free hand; he threatened to invade Germany and Italy, to stable his horses in St. Peter's, and feed them on its Altar.

Now that danger threatened Rome, Pope Boniface IX. (1389—1404), issued a Bull, complaining of the misery inflicted by the Turks on the Eastern Church, and of the jealousies of the Western Princes, which prevented them from making common cause against the infidels; and he proclaimed a Crusade. Germany and France responded to his call; but in the fatal Battle of Nicopolis, in September, 1396, the Christians, led by Sigismond, King of Hungary, suffered a disastrous defeat from

Bajazet, the greater part of their army being either slain in battle, or drowned in the waters of the Danube.

The fall of Constantinople now seemed imminent, and that of Western Christendom likely to follow. At the time that Bajazet was at the height of his glory, an unexpected event stemmed the tide of history. In 1400 Bajazet suffered, at Angora, on the plains of Asia Minor, a crushing defeat from Timour or Tamerlane, like himself a Mahometan, who had in 1369 seated himself on the throne of Samarcand; the Ottoman power was almost annihilated, and its recovery is one of the most wonderful events in history; Bajazet himself was taken prisoner and died in captivity. Thus the Christians had a breathing time, and the fall of Constantinople was delayed for more than fifty years. That would have been the time for a Crusade; had the Princes of the West, who were distracted by their own quarrels, had any one to induce them to coalesce, Europe might have been for ever delivered from the infidels. The period (1378—1417) was that of the Great Schism in the Roman Church, when there were two and sometimes three Popes, one anathematizing the other; half of Europe following one Pope, and half another; and no one knowing which was the rightful Pope.

No sooner was Urban VI. elected, than the Great Schism broke out. Urban, who was a native of Calabria, an honest man lacking the polish of a Frenchman, called one of the French Cardinals a fool; whereupon the Cardinal retorted by calling the Pope "a Calabrian liar." The Cardinals then elected another Pope, Clement VII. (1378—1394), and returned to Avignon.

The opportunity was for ever lost; ten years after the death of Bajazet a perfect restoration of the Ottoman

power was effected by Bajazet's son, Mahomet I. (1413—1421).

The Western councils which were held in the early part of the fifteenth century do not primarily affect the Eastern Church, till we come to the council of Basle, which was canonically summoned to meet in 1431, by Pope Martin V., of which therefore the councils of Ferrara and Florence were schismatical off-shoots. But from the previous councils of the century some useful lessons may be learnt.

The summoning of the council of Pisa, A.D. 1409, by the Cardinals, and the sentence pronounced by the Patriarch of Alexandria deposing two contending Popes, is a recognition of the principle that Patriarchs and Popes are amenable to the Councils of the Church. This was confirmed by the councils of Constance and Basle. The former council ruled that to a General Council lawfully assembled (*legitimè congregata*) in the Holy Ghost, even the Pope (*etiam si Papalis existat*) owes obedience.

The Emperor Sigismond, in presiding at the Council of Constance, revived one of the highest functions of his predecessors, and carried out the principle inaugurated by the first Christian Emperor, Constantine the Great. The decree of the council, forbidding Communion in Both Kinds, shows that General Councils "may err and have erred even in things pertaining unto God;" and the Œcumenical character claimed by the majority of Roman Catholics for the above-mentioned councils, but denied by the Gallican Church, renders it impossible for members of the Greek and Anglican Churches to decide, how many Œcumenical Councils the Roman Catholic Church really holds.

The forty years schism in the Roman Church was

healed by the election of Pope Martin V. (1417—February, 1431). In 1422 the Pope sent envoys to the Emperor, Manuel II. (1391—1425), pointing out how the Turks profited by the disunion, and stating that the Latins would be readier to help the Greeks if the Churches were united. The Emperor did not consider the time opportune, and advised his son John that failure would only confirm the schism, and leave the Greeks for the future more hopelessly at the mercy of the Turks.

It appears, however, that John had already sent envoys to Rome on the subject of re-union; and in October of the same year, envoys arrived from Rome bearing the Pope's answer, which John laid before the Patriarchs, and a large assemblage of Greeks and Latins. It stated that the Pope had heard that the Greeks spoke of the Latins as dogs. Envoys, however, who had lately arrived from the East, assured him of a desire for re-union on the part of both the Emperor and Patriarch; of their willingness to embrace the faith and obey the Church of Rome, and of their wish for a council, which he himself also advocated. As soon as an agreement was arrived at the Greeks might rely on Western assistance against the Turks. John replied that his envoys had exceeded their instructions. Nevertheless he was ready to abide by a General Council, assembled on the principle of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, and Constantinople was a suitable place of meeting. Constantinople was objected to by the Pope and no envoys were sent.

On the day on which the Pope's envoys arrived, Manuel was seized by the paralysis from which he never recovered; and on his death his son, John VI., became Emperor (1425—1448). In 1431 Eugenius IV. (March, 1431—

1439) succeeded Martin V. as Pope. The reduced extent of his dominions; his decreasing revenues; the threatening attitude of the Sultan Murad II. (1421—1451); and the inadequate defences of Constantinople, convinced the Emperor that without Western help he could not defend Constantinople, and that his only hope lay in acknowledging at any price the Pope's supremacy.

The Council of Basle, of which the two objects were, the re-union of East and West, and the reform of the Church in its head and members, held its first session on December 14, 1431. Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, whom Pope Martin had nominated President, expressed his preference for the reform of the Church, to the re-union of East and West, "the old song (*ista cantilena*), which had run on for three centuries without result." Eugenius, when he found that the council re-iterated the decision of Constance that a Pope is subject to councils, and that several decrees little to his liking were passed, did everything in his power to discredit it; and when, on July 31, 1437, it cited him to appear in person within sixty days, he ordered the transference of the council to Ferrara. Thereupon the Basle council, in October, pronounced the Pope contumacious; in the same month it declared his order for the transference of the council invalid; and in January of the following year it excommunicated and suspended him.

The Pope set the council at defiance, and retorted with a counter-sentence of excommunication; and in the same month opened the council of Ferrara.

Thus there was again a schism in the Roman Church, which, unmindful of its own schism, thought to effect the re-union of Christendom.

Both councils invited the Emperor to attend, and both

sent vessels to Constantinople to convey him. John cared nothing which council he attended; but the Pope was the higher bidder, and his vessels conveyed away the Emperor, his brother Demetrius, the aged and feeble-minded Patriarch, Joseph II. (1416—1439); pretending representatives of the three absent Patriarchs; some prominent Bishops, amongst whom were Bessarion, Archbishop of Nicæa, Mark of Ephesus, Isidore the Primate of Russia; some Archimandrites as representatives of the monks, and some secular clergy; Syropulus, the chronicler of the voyage and of the acts of the council, being one of the many who were reluctantly compelled to swell the train of the Emperor.

Sismondi thus sums up the character of Pope Eugenius IV.:—"Sans cesse engagé en guerre avec son clergé —il manque presque toujours de la bonne foi et de la politique. Il y a peu de tyrans a qui on peut reprocher plus d'actes de perfidie et de cruauté; il y a peu de monarches imbecilles qui aient donne plus de preuves d'incapacité et d'inconsequence."

The Emperor and the greater part of the envoys arrived at Ferrara before the Patriarch, who was old and travelled slower. The Pope had been profuse in his promises; but whilst the Emperor fared sumptuously and passed his time pleasantly in hunting in the neighbourhood of Ferrara, every kind of indignity was heaped upon the aged Patriarch. Before leaving Constantinople he had bound himself to have no dealings with the Pope except as his equal. The first thing demanded of him was that he should kiss the Pope's feet. "Did the other Apostles kiss St. Peter's feet?" he asked; and he threatened to return home; and not for several days did the Pope grant him an audience.

The Council commenced its proceedings with an anathema on the council of Basle. After the second session, the Pope was represented by Julian Cæsarini, who transferred his allegiance from Basle to the Pope's council. His place at Basle was taken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Arles.

We need not enter into the dissensions at Ferrara between the Greeks and Latins, for (two months after danger from it had passed away) the Pope, on the plea of the existence of the plague, transferred the council to Florence, where a much more notable council was held (February 26—June 6, 1439).

The Council was attended by only eighty bishops, of whom sixty-two were Latins, and eighteen Greeks. The chief speakers were, on the part of the Latins, Julian Cæsarini; of the Greeks, Isidore, Bessarion, and Mark of Ephesus. The four great points of discussion, which had been before discussed at Ferrara, were:—(1) The Procession of the Holy Ghost; (a) whether it was Orthodox; and, if so, whether (b) it ought to be introduced into the Creed in spite of the Council of Ephesus. (2) The use of leavened or unleavened bread in the Eucharist. (3) Purgatory. (4) The Pope's Supremacy. The doctrine of Purgatory had been fully discussed at Ferrara; the Greeks maintained that Purgatory is a state of gloom and exclusion from God's presence.

The chief debate at Florence was on the Procession. Bessarion, who was gradually drawing nearer the Pope's side, contended that the difference between the two Churches was one of expression rather than of doctrine; that the Greek ἐκ Πατρός meant the same as the Latin ex Patre Filioque; Mark of Ephesus declared all holders of the double Procession to be heretics and schismatics.

The Emperor, having first stipulated with the Pope for the defence of Constantinople, was resolved on the union. Much the same occurred as had occurred at Rimini. The Greek Bishops were intimidated; they had been kept in close confinement, with barely sufficient food to keep them from starvation; their resources were exhausted; and they saw no means of their being replenished, no hope of returning to their Dioceses, so long as they stood out against the Pope and Emperor; Mark of Ephesus, and perhaps Gregory, Metropolitan of Georgia[o], together with Demetrius, to avoid witnessing the union effected, retired to Venice. Le Quien[p] styles Mark "turbarum scandalarumque auctor;" but so important a bishop was he that Eugenius exclaimed, "without him all our labours are lost!"

As to leavened or unleavened bread, a compromise was effected; each Church might preserve its custom; but the Latins got all they cared for; the Filioque, Purgatory, the Pope's supremacy (with some vague recognition of the Patriarch of Constantinople), were conceded to the Latins; and the Treaty of Union was signed. The Patriarch Joseph died, and was buried in the Baptistery of Florence; (Macarius says[q] he refused to sign the union); the Te Deum was chanted in the Cathedral in Greek; the Mass celebrated by the Pope in Latin; and the Creed sung with the addition of the Filioque; and the Emperor and Greeks sailed away for Constantinople.

The Council of Florence was, says Macarius[r], repudiated in "Constantinople, Russia, Georgia, Servia, Moldavia, and other Orthodox countries." No sooner did the

[o] See Malan's *Georgian Church*, p. 139. [p] I. 308. [q] III. 589. [r] III. 590.

Emperor set foot in Constantinople, than the flimsy fabric of the union melted into air. Those who had subscribed were branded as traitors, contact with them being avoided ; and the Churches, as soon as they entered, were deserted. Mark of Ephesus was the universal hero. Metrophanes II., translated from Cyzicus as successor to Joseph, was stigmatized as *μητροφόνος*, the slayer of their Mother-Church. The bishops, several of whom were Latins holding Greek sees, now joined the Orthodox side against the Emperor ; declared that their assent to the union had been extorted, and publicly retracted their subscription. The three other Eastern Patriarchs, Philotheus of Alexandria, Dorotheus of Antioch, and Joachim of Jerusalem, in a synod at Jerusalem, A.D. 1443, with one voice condemned the union ; threatened to excommunicate the Emperor and all that adhered to it ; denounced Metrophanes as a heretic, and cancelled his Ordinations. The Emperor's brother Demetrius raised the standard of rebellion ; but the Greeks thought one Palæologus as bad as another, and refused to make a change.

Thus ended the last united effort to heal the schism of the Eastern and Western Churches. The only permanent results of the Council of Florence were to intensify the hatred of the Greeks against the Latins, and to make them indifferent as to the fate of the expiring Empire.

After the Council of Florence, Bessarion and Isidore joined the Roman Church, of which they were created Cardinals. Bessarion was appointed bishop of Tusculum ; and, but for his being a Greek, "the bearded goat," as he was nick-named, would probably have succeeded Eugenius as Pope.

The Pope, not unmindful of his promise to the

Emperor, and at the same time apprehensive of a Turkish invasion of Italy, despatched an expedition, under Cardinal Julian Cæsarini, against the Turks. Murad II., having been lately defeated by Hunyades, the famous Hungarian Commander, had entered on a treaty for ten years, highly favourable to the Christians; Servia regained its independence as a free Kingdom, and Wallachia was ceded to Hungary. The treaty was ratified by the most solemn oaths—by the Christians on the Gospels, by the Mahometans on the Koran. The Cardinal succeeded in persuading the young Hungarian King Ladislaus that without the sanction of Christ's Vicar, the Roman Pontiff, they could neither promise nor perform; and he absolved them from their oath. Gibbon, with reason, says [s] the Turks might well retort the epithet of Infidel upon the Christians.

The two armies met on November 14, 1444, on the field of Varna; the treaty, "the monument of Christian perfidy," was displayed by the Turks upon the field; ten thousand Christians fell in the battle; Cæsarini's victim, the young Ladislaus, now King of the united Hungary and Poland, being amongst the slain; Hunyades effected his escape, but the fugitive Cæsarini was murdered on the banks of the Danube.

The Emperor John, who, finding no benefit forthcoming from the Latin alliance, in the last years of his life renounced the Florentine Union, was succeeded, by the consent of the Sultan Murad (for the acknowledged supremacy of the Sultan preceded the fall of Constantinople), by his brother Constantine XI. (*Dragases*, 1448—1453), the last and best (or rather the only good one)

[s] XII. 159.

of the dynasty of the Palæologi. Constantine was crowned at Sparta, where he and his brother Thomas (the latter destined to play an important part in Russian history) resided; and from fear of dissensions between Orthodox and Unionists, he declined a second coronation in St. Sophia's.

The Sultan Murad was succeeded by his son Mahomet II. (1451—1481). The great aim of Mahomet's ambition was the capture of Constantinople, and he soon appeared before its walls. Nicolas V., a liberal patron of the Renaissance, who asserted, with regard to the council of Basle, that God alone is superior to General Councils, was Pope of Rome (1447—1455). Constantine, whose last hope was reposed on Western assistance, now applied to Nicolas, professing obedience and expressing his willingness to accept the union of the Churches under any terms. The Pope was offended at the failure of the Florentine Union, and the Emperor John's return to Orthodoxy; he moreover placed no confidence in the success of the Greek cause. He however sent to Constantinople Isidore, the former Metropolitan of Kief, now a Roman Cardinal, the most objectionable man he could have selected; and before him the Emperor subscribed the Union; on December 12, 1452, Isidore celebrated Mass in the Cathedral of St. Sophia; and there the Union of the Churches was proclaimed. The Greeks were now placed in the dilemma of submission to Rome, by which alone Western help could be obtained, or submission to the Ottomans. The Court, and some of the higher clergy, preferred the former; but to the Greeks generally the Union was more hateful than ever; the secular clergy, almost with one voice, the monks, the nuns, the laity, repudiated it. As soon as the service commenced the

congregation left the Cathedral as a place polluted. The Unionists were branded with sacrificing their Church, with preferring the interests of their bodies to the good of their souls, with insulting God to please the Pope. The clergy bound themselves with a vow that under penalty of forfeiting their Orders they never would be united to the Church of Rome.

However favourable the Pope may have been, Western help was not available. The Emperor complained that he was surrounded by men whom he could neither love nor trust; and it was evident to him that the unwilling, or at the best half-hearted, Greeks were unequal to the defence of Constantinople, even with its impregnable forts. On May 29, 1453, thirteen years after the abortive council of Florence, Constantinople fell. The Emperor having received the Eucharist in St. Sophia's, and asked forgiveness from all whom he might have offended, died the death of a hero; his head, severed from his body by the Janissaries, being carried round the city as a trophy of victory.

Thus an infidel power gained possession of the most important capital in Christendom, and the Sultans succeeded to the position of the Greek Emperors.

Amongst the many melancholy reflexions which centre round the fall of Constantinople, one of the saddest is, that it was mainly effected by Greeks, by the corps of Janissaries formed from the kidnapped children of Christian parents; by soldiers fighting against soldiers of the same Christian blood as themselves. This tribute of Christian children was the fiendish institution of the Emir Orkhan. The strongest and most promising boys were, at ages between six and nine, torn away from their families, cut off from every Christian tie, and educated

so as to know no other than the Mahometan faith, to abjure which afterwards was the punishment of renegades, certain death. They were trained in the profession of arms, and grew to be the best soldiers in the Turkish armies. At first about 1,000, they swelled in numbers till at the time of the fall of Constantinople they formed a standing army of 20,000 warriors.

In order to pay his unwilling soldiers Constantine, poor as they were in comparison to their riches and splendour previously to the Fourth Crusade, despoiled the Churches; whatever remained of the plate and vestments was divided amongst the conquerors. Many acts of rapacity and many dark deeds were committed, many thousands of both sexes sold into captivity. But Mahometans might well plead the example of Christians; we hear of no act of sacrilege for its own sake; and one thing is certain, that the Orthodox Greeks met with greater toleration from Mahometans than they had met with from Latin Catholics.

No sooner had the city fallen than the panic-stricken Greeks were at one again, and St. Sophia's was filled with worshippers of every age and station. Isidore, in terror and despair, was barely able to make, in disguise, his escape from the city. The Sultan allowed the Orthodox Church to elect its Patriarch, and George Scholarius, who had favoured the Florentine Union but had been turned to Orthodoxy by Mark of Ephesus, was elected under his monastic name of Gennadius, and took up his residence in the monastery of the Apostles.

The Cathedral of St. Sophia, the noblest Christian temple in the world, built to commemorate the Wisdom of God, was converted into a Mosque, the Crescent of the old pagan Byzantium taking the place of the Cross on

the summit of its dome. The Church of the Holy Apostles was at first granted by the Sultan to Gennadius, but the grant was soon revoked ; it too was converted into a Mosque, the Mosque which still bears the name of Mahomet. About forty other churches were appropriated by the Turks, Mahomet leaving the remainder to the Christians.

CHAPTER X.

The Greek Church after the Fall of Constantinople.

After the fall of Constantinople the remaining fragments of the Eastern Empire gradually succumbed to the Turks. In 1459 Servia; in 1461 Trebizond, the last remaining seat of the Eastern Empire; in 1463 Bosnia; in 1467 Albania; in 1483 Herzegovina were conquered. On his new subjects Mahomet imposed the tribute of Christian children, as it existed in other parts of his dominions.

In the year before Mahomet's death Otranto in Southern Italy fell to the Turks; had that been kept, Italy as well as Greece might have fallen. Now that danger threatened Rome, the Pope must have lamented the unwise course of his predecessors in depressing the Eastern Church and Empire; and Pope Sixtus IV. was actually preparing to fly beyond the Alps when Mahomet died in the fifty-first year of his age; and Otranto was re-taken from the Turks by Naples.

Under Mahomet's son Bajazet (1481—1512), no important conquests, except that of Herzegovina, were made by the Turks. Bajazet was forced to abdicate by his son, Selim I., surnamed *the Cruel*, who then became Sultan (1512—1520). Selim, who in systematic blood-thirstiness out-did all his predecessors, ordered the conversion or massacre of all Christians in his dominions, and the conversion of the churches into mosques; acts from which he was diverted by his Divan. Having deposed the

Abasside Caliph he took upon himself the office and title of Caliph; and from his time to the present day the Turkish Sultans have exercised spiritual as well as temporal authority. Under Selim, Palestine and Egypt were added to the Ottoman dominions; thus the Holy Sepulchre came into the hands of the Turks.

In the long reign of Selim's son, Suleiman I. or Solomon (1520—1566), called the *Inflexible* and the *Legislator*, the Ottoman power reached its culminating point. In the first year of his reign he invaded Hungary, and in a second invasion, in 1526, he took Buda, inflicting on Hungary a blow from which it never recovered. Between those two invasions he in 1522 besieged Rhodes, which belonged to the Knights Hospitallers; and after a siege of six months the Crescent was victorious over the Cross. Solomon spared the Order; the few surviving Knights, under their Grand Master, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, left Rhodes, and eventually received from the Emperor Charles V. the Island of Malta, where they were known as the Knights of Malta; which they in 1526 successfully defended against the Turks, inflicting on them a loss of 25,000 men.

In 1536 the most Christian King, Francis I. of France, scandalized Christendom by entering into an alliance with Solomon against his inveterate enemy, the Emperor Charles V.

In 1571 the Turks under Solomon's son, Selim II. (1566—1574), surnamed Möst (*the drunkard*), suffered a disastrous defeat from Don John of Austria in the battle of Lepanto; but in the same year they took Cyprus from the Venetians. The battle of Lepanto is generally considered the turning-point in the tide of Ottoman prosperity; but they were strong enough to wrest in 1574 Tunis from Spain. Since that year, with

the exception of Crete, which they captured in 1669, they have made no permanent conquests of importance ; and the slow process of Turkish dismemberment soon afterwards began.

After the fall of Constantinople the history of the four Orthodox Patriarchates consisted of little more than a string of names, and a series of depositions and murders of Patriarchs, and persecution. The Patriarch of Constantinople still continued to be the recognized head of the Orthodox Church, the dignity and importance of which really centred round the Greco-Russian Church, under which it may be hoped it will some day recover its proper place in Christ's Vineyard.

In the Pontificate of Jeremias II., Patriarch of Constantinople, an interesting, though ineffectual, correspondence was carried on between the Greek Church and the Lutheran Reformers. In 1559 Melancthon sent to Constantinople, through Demetrius, a Greek deacon who was returning from Wittenberg, a letter written in Greek to the Patriarch Joasaph II., with a copy of the Augsburg Confession, setting forth the agreement of the Lutherans with the primitive Church and the early Fathers ; but, says Mosheim, the Lutherans were disappointed, for the Patriarch did not vouchsafe to answer it.

The matter was re-opened in 1574 in a letter to the Patriarch Jeremias II. (who had been raised to the Patriarchal throne on the deposition of Metrophanes III.), containing the Augsburg Confession, written by Martin Crusius, Greek Professor, and sent through Stephen Gerlac, a student in the University of Tubingen. Jeremias, a prelate distinguished for his learning as well as for his zeal in extirpating simony, which was at the time prevalent in the Greek Church, returned a courteous

answer; to which Crusius replied in the Spring of the following year. He asked the Patriarch's judgment on the Augsburg Confession; stated that the Lutherans had abandoned the doctrines and discipline of Rome; and expressed a hope that Constantinople and Tubingen were united in the bonds of Christian orthodoxy and love.

Notwithstanding the attempts of Romanists in Constantinople to stop the correspondence, Jeremias, in the Autumn of the same year, returned an answer, saying that he had given instructions that the various Articles of the Augsburg Confession should be examined; and on June 18, 1576, his judgment arrived at Tubingen. It condemned *νομοθεσίαν καινότομον* (*any new-fangled system*), and expressed willingness to be at one with "the most learned Germans," if, "agreeably with us, they would follow the Apostolical and synodical decrees," so that "they would really be members of our Communion."

The Tubingen divines had commenced the correspondence by taking it for granted that there was no *via media* between Romanism and their Protestantism, and that the Greeks, because they were not Papists, must be Protestants. Their answer, written June 18, 1577, was signed by Lucius Osiander, Court Chaplain, the father-in-law of Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martin Crusius; it defended the Augsburg Confession and the points on which they differed from the Greek Church. And another letter from Crucius, received in Constantinople on March 4, 1578, gave a fuller account of the Lutheran system.

The Patriarch was at that time absent in Thessaly; on his return to Constantinople he, in May, 1579, wrote to the Tubingen Divines apologising for his delay, but adhering to his former judgment. He told him that in follow-

ing modern doctrine the Lutherans misinterpreted certain passages of Scripture, which it was necessary that they should receive, as interpreted by the Œcumenical Doctors and the Seven Councils.

On December 24 of that year Jeremias was deposed, and Metrophanes re-instated. The correspondence was continued by the Tubingen Divines in a letter written on St. John Baptist's Day, 1580, defending their views and refuting those of the Greek Church. On August 11 Metrophanes died, and Jeremias was restored; on June 6, 1581, he wrote his last letter to Tubingen, dwelling especially on the double Procession, but declining further correspondence from which he could see no benefit was to be derived;—"We request you no further to trouble us, nor to send letters about the same things;—but, if you please, letters of friendship only." A last letter from the Lutherans, dated December, 1581, concluded the correspondence [a].

The whole strain of the Patriarch's Answers shows, as Mosheim remarks, an unalterable attachment of the Greeks to the opinions and institutions of their Church. "The members of the Eastern Church," writes Mr. Blackmore [b], "are neither bound in conscience, on the one hand, to every word of any modern documents, nor left free, on the other hand, to indulge in an unlimited licence of criticism. Beyond the Creed itself, the Eastern Church has no general doctrinal tests—no XXXIX. Articles, like that subscribed in England."

Beyond the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed, no authoritative exposition of faith was promulgated till the sixteenth century, the "Treatise on the Orthodox Faith"

[a] See Articles in British Magazine, Vols. XVIII. and XIX.

[b] *Doctrine of the Russian Church.*

of St. John Damascene being considered a sufficient guide[c].

The correspondence of the Patriarch of Constantinople with the Tubingen Divines was of the utmost importance, for *The Answers of the Patriarch Jeremias* form the earliest modern doctrinal authority of the Greek Church, and bear the same relation to the Lutherans that *The Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem,* of which mention will be made further on, bear to the Calvinists. "Luther," says the Preface to the Synod of Bethlehem, "is in mind and spirit twin-brother to Calvin." The document was afterwards approved by the Synod of Jassy, A.D. 1642, under Parthenius, Patriarch of Constantinople; and by that of Bethlehem, A.D. 1672, under Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem. It was put forth before the Greek Church was subjected to Western influence, and is free from the Latinism which marks the later authoritative documents of the Orthodox Greek Church.

Notwithstanding the rebuff given to the Tubingen Divines by Jeremias, a wave of Protestantism, which at that time was the exclusive title of Lutheranism, was evidently passing over the East; and to a certain extent coloured the teaching of the great Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar. In order to understand the troubles of his episcopate, a digression into the constitution of the Greek Church, as settled after the fall of Constantinople, is necessary.

That a Mahometan, whose watchword was the Koran, Tribute, or the Sword, would favour Christianity for its own sake, was not to be expected. But Mahomet II.

[c] Ἔκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ἀρθόξου πίστεως.

was a statesman as well as a soldier. Under him Constantinople became the capital of the Turkish Empire, and Mahomet took up his residence in the Imperial palace; but under him no attempt was made to proselytize; his religious policy was guided by his civil interest, which led him to declare himself the protector of the Orthodox Church. He organized the Greek nation on an ecclesiastical model, of which the Patriarchal Synod was the head. He allowed the Orthodox Church to choose its Patriarch, but reserved to the Sultan the right which had appertained to the Christian Emperors, of their confirmation, which virtually meant, under his successors, their appointment and deposition.

The bishops took the place of the old Greek aristocracy, which was almost entirely annihilated; the Greek prelates, says Finlay [d], acted as a kind of Ottoman Prefects over the Orthodox population, of whom the Patriarch was the recognized head. The remnant of the old nobility came in time to be called Phanariots, from their residing in the Phanar Quarter of Constantinople.

Whilst the Patriarchate of Constantinople was an office of great dignity and importance, the three other Patriarchs were to the Sultans comparatively insignificant. Those prelates, being elected by the suffrages of the bishops, were the most distinguished amongst the clergy for their learning or piety, and being out of sight of the Sultans were generally out of mind. But the history of the Patriarchs of Constantinople is a series of depositions, exiles, and murders. The Patriarchate came to be regarded by the Sultans and Viziers as a source of revenue, and was often conferred on the highest bidder rather than

[d] VI. 10.

on the ground of ecclesiastical fitness. The object being to get as much money as possible, the more unfit the candidate, the more acceptable was he to the Sultan; for his unfitness would render him unacceptable to the Greeks, and the Vizier was always ready to lend his ear to any excuse for deposing him, as a means of putting money into the Sultan's pocket by a fresh election.

After the death of Jeremias, three Patriarchs of Constantinople followed in the space of two years. Cyril Lucar fell a victim to the avarice of the Turks, combined with the bigotry and jealousy of the Jesuits; and was deposed five times. The average price for obtaining and being re-instated in the Patriarchate was 25,000 dollars; the money had to be obtained from the Turks, who charged usurious interest; so that in 1672 the Church of Constantinople was hampered with a debt of 350,000 dollars. But we are anticipating.

Cyril Lucar was born, A.D. 1572, at Candia, in the Island of Crete. At the time that the neighbouring nations were suffering persecution from the Turks, Crete was still under the gentle rule of the Venetians, who, although they belonged to the Roman Church, allowed their subjects the free exercise of their religion. To this toleration Cyril owed his education in the faith of the Greek Church, and his being carefully guarded against Latin influence.

At the age of ten years he was sent to study at Alexandria under his uncle, Meletius Pega, like himself a native of Crete, who, though educated in Italy, formed a strong prejudice against the Roman Church. His education Cyril completed at Venice and Padua, in which former University Maximus, afterwards bishop of Cerigo and a strong opponent of Rome, was his tutor. Under such

influences he was confirmed in his attachment to the Greek Church.

He next proceeded on a tour through Western Europe, where, especially in Germany and Switzerland, he formed a favourable opinion of Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines. Returning to Alexandria, he was, in 1595, ordained deacon by Meletius, who had in the meantime been appointed Patriarch of Alexandria.

In 1596 the Unia, of which further mention will be made in a future chapter [e], was established at Brest. At this period of his life Cyril was accused by Peter Skarga, who with Possevin were the leaders of the Jesuits, of writing a letter (which is generally supposed to be a forgery) to the bishop of Löwenburg, professing allegiance to the Roman Church. Cyril afterwards admitted in a letter to Antonio di Dominis, bishop of Spalato, on the conversion of the latter from Romanism, that he once had a leaning towards the Roman Church, but that, on comparing the doctrines of the Reformers with those of the Greek and Roman Churches, he preferred the Reformers. At any rate his tendency to Romanism must have been short-lived, for it was his opposition to the Unia that, in 1600, lost him the headship of the Greek seminary at Ostrog.

In 1602 he succeeded Meletius as Patriarch of Alexandria, and from that time the reformation of the Greek Church was the great object of his life.

The history of Cyril Lucar is of peculiar interest to the Anglican Church. Friendly relations between the Greek and Anglican Churches, although, owing to circumstances, they were necessarily suspended, have never been

[e] Chap. III. Pt. 2.

broken off. Intercourse was renewed through Cyril Lucar. King James I., sympathizing with the Greek Church in its persecution by the Turks, offered education in England free of expense for a Greek. Cyril sent over in 1616 a young Greek named Metrophanes Critopulos, with a commendatory letter to Archbishop Abbot. Abbot befriended Metrophanes; he was given an education free of expense for six years at Balliol College, Oxford, Abbot furnishing him with a good library. Much to Cyril's surprise, Metrophanes fell into bad company, and his conduct was not to the satisfaction of Abbot, who consequently sent him £10 to get him out of England. This, however, was no easy matter, and Abbot wrote to Sir Thomas Lowe at Constantinople that he had again more than once made his appearance. He eventually settled in Germany, where was published in 1625 a work of which the Lutherans assigned to him the authorship, entitled *A Confession of Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East.*

Luthero-Calvinist at the time there seems little doubt that he was; he afterwards became (although some, and amongst them Le Quien [f], doubt the identity) bishop of Memphis, and eventually Patriarch of Alexandria, which last post he is said to have obtained by Lutheran gold; and in that capacity he attended the synod of 1636. He must, however, have completely altered his views; for not only did he join the synod in a sweeping condemnation of Calvinistic and Lutheran doctrines, but he showed himself deeply ungrateful to his former patron, and subscribed the anathema pronounced against Cyril.

The intercourse so auspiciously renewed by King

[f] II. 508.

James I. was continued under King Charles I. Cyril corresponded with Archbishop Laud, and presented him, "as a sign of brotherly love," with an Arabic Pentateuch, now to be found in the Bodleian at Oxford; he dedicated to King Charles one of his works, and presented him with that priceless treasure, the Codex Alexandrinus, in the British Museum.

Cyril, not thinking the differences between the Churches important, conceived the idea of reforming the Greek Church on the model of the Reformers.

The Greek Church has always had a fossilized aversion to change. Rejecting all mediæval and modern accretions, and holding the faith of the Apostles and the Seven Œcumenical Councils, it believes that it does not need reform. The Greeks abhorred the Unia; and they feared lest, through a suspicion of Protestantism attaching to their Church, the number of Uniats might be increased. So that Cyril's reforming tendencies did not gain him favour with the Greek Church.

On the deposition, in 1612, of Neophytus, Patriarch of Constantinople, a large party of bishops desired that Cyril should be appointed; but through the influence of the Jesuits, Timothy, Metropolitan of Patras, a favourer of the Unia, became Patriarch. On the death of Timothy in 1621, Cyril, to the dismay of the Pope and Jesuits, as well as the Latinizing clergy and Kaloirs, received the approbation of the Vizier, and was translated to Constantinople. In the following month Sir Thomas Lowe, who afterwards nobly espoused Cyril's cause, arrived as English ambassador to the Porte. Cyril's intimacy with the English and Dutch ambassadors laid him open to the malice of the French ambassador, who sided with the Jesuits against him.

It is unnecessary to describe the circumstances attending Cyril's five depositions; a few must suffice as a specimen of all.

The Jesuits found a pliant tool in Gregory, Metropolitan of Amasia, styled from his misfortune Monophthalmos (*one-eyed*), "who had submitted to the Pope." Cyril was first accused of heresy; this accusation he met by a synodical sentence of excommunication against Gregory.

Cyril was next accused to the Vizier of treasonable designs, a false but fatal charge; and before he had been Patriarch one year, he was banished to Rhodes. Gregory then purchased the Patriarchate, but being unable to find the money was, within three months, banished and strangled (ἐπνίγη). Anthimus, Metropolitan of Adrianople, was next appointed, but being obnoxious to the Greeks was, after a few days, deposed. By the intervention of Sir Thomas Lowe, Cyril was then restored, and eight years elapsed before his second banishment.

In June, 1627, a Greek Kaloir named Metaxa, whom Cyril had sent to London to learn the art of printing, arrived with a printing press from England, which, with the permission of the Vizier, and under the protection of the English ambassador, he set up in Constantinople. The Jesuits and the French ambassador, fearing that it might be used for the publication of anti-Roman books, denounced it to the Vizier as a dangerous invention; and Cyril was accused of using it for political purposes. Metaxa, in danger of his life, took refuge in Sir Thomas Lowe's house, and the press was confiscated.

In 1630, the *Confession of Faith* attributed to Cyril, which, in consequence of the suppression of the printing-

press, could not be printed at Constantinople, was brought out in Latin at Geneva. It purported to be written in the name of the Greek Church. Whether or not it was Cyril's work was and still is a vexed question, the Latins attributing it to him, the Greeks refusing to allow it to be the work of one of their Patriarchs; but as Cyril not only did not deny but claimed the authorship, there seems to be little doubt of the fact.

The work consisting of XVIII Articles was of a decidedly Calvinistic character, and agreed with Protestants on those points which differentiated them from the Greek and Roman Churches. At the same time it contained sound doctrine on essential matters;—Art. XV. limits the number of Sacraments to two, which are signs and means of Grace.—XVI. holds baptismal regeneration.—XVII. a real Presence in the Eucharist; and it speaks of "the rashly devised doctrine of Transubstantiation;" XVIII. condemns the doctrine of Purgatory. It is evident that these Articles would find little favour at Rome.

In 1633 a Greek edition was published, likewise at Geneva, in answer to a work entitled *Censura Confessionis Fidei seu potius Perfidiæ Calvinianæ*, dedicated to Pope Urban VIII.

His bitter enemies the Jesuits, supported by the French ambassador, accused him to the Greeks of introducing novel doctrines into the Orthodox Church. The higher Greek Clergy disbelieved the charge and stood by him; but a strong feeling in the Orthodox Church was excited against him. The charges went on with increasing malignity; one of stirring up disaffection against the Turkish Government the Vizier saw through and disbelieved, and stood by him. Then came a more hideous one. Cyril had written against the Jews a book on our Lord's Di-

vinity. This work the Jesuits, who well knew that apostacy from Islam was a capital offence, distorted into a meaning reflecting on the Koran, and intended to draw the Turks from their faith. Here again they failed; the Vizier disbelieved them, and the Jesuits were expelled from Constantinople as disturbers of the public peace.

In October, 1633, Cyril Lucar found an enemy in Cyril of Berœa, who had been educated at Galata under the Jesuits, whose creature he was. Cyril Lucar had already been twice deposed, and was on each occasion restored through the influence of the English Ambassador. He had now to make way to his namesake of Berœa, who offered a bribe of 50,000 dollars; but being unable to find the money he was soon thrown into prison. The next bidder was Athanasius, whom Cyril had himself preferred to the Archbishopric of Thessalonica, who, in 1634, obtained the Patriarchate by the payment of 60,000 dollars; after one month he too was deposed.

In March, 1635, Cyril of Berœa succeeded in finding the requisite sum, and was enabled to hold the Patriarchate for about eighteen months, during which it was entirely governed by the Jesuits. Cyril Lucar was then again re-instated. As the Roman party found the money by which the Jesuits intruded the pseudo-Patriarchs, there can be little doubt that the English Government, which was brought to the side of justice by its ambassadors, contributed to Cyril's restorations; but, says Dr. Smith, Chaplain at Constantinople in 1668, "the poor Greeks" were almost ruined.

In 1638 the Jesuits took advantage of the absence from Constantinople of the Vizier, whom they knew to be his friend, to compass Cyril Lucar's ruin. The Sultan

Murad IV., accompanied by the Vizier, had left Constantinople on an expedition against the Persians. It was represented to the Turkish Government that Cyril was too influential a man to be left in Constantinople, for that he might incite the Janissaries to rebellion. The Sultan, alarmed at the groundless representations which were forwarded to him, issued an order for his strangulation. On June 27 he was, under pretence that he was being sent into one of his customary banishments, inveigled on board a ship, and was strangled; his body, thrown into the sea, when brought to land by some fishermen, was denied Christian burial, till some friends secretly by night consigned it to rest in one of the secluded islands in the Bay of Nicomedia. Such was the end of the great Patriarch; he died the victim of religious bigotry and treachery.

As to the nature of his reforms there may be a difference of opinion; it is certain that both in the East and West propagators of Calvinism claimed his authority; as to his sincerity there can be only one opinion; for Leo Allatius is altogether undeserving of credit, and is reproved even by Le Quien[s]; and if any member of the Church merits the title of Saint and Martyr it is Cyril Lucar.

Cyril II. (of Berœa) succeeded him. In 1638, the year of his appointment, he held a synod at Constantinople, which took for granted that the *Confession* was Cyril Lucar's, and anathematized both the book, and Cyril as its author. Under Cyril II. the union of the Greek and Latin Churches on the terms of the Union of Florence seemed imminent.

[s] II. 506.

"Neque enim lex justior ulla est
Quam necis artifices arte perire suâ;"

in 1639 Cyril II. was himself banished, one of the charges against him being that, by falsely accusing Cyril Lucar to the Turks, he had been accessory to his death; and by order of the Sultan he suffered the same punishment as his innocent predecessor. The next Patriarch, Parthenius I., was also murdered.

Parthenius (who, Le Quien wrongly says, favoured the Calvinists), held in 1642 a second synod at Constantinople, in which the *Confession* as well as Calvinism was condemned; but Cyril Lucar was not charged with being its author, nor condemned by name.

Under Parthenius, in 1642, was held the famous Synod of Jassy, in Moldavia[h]; by the Synod the *Confession* was condemned, and also its author; but it was spoken of as *attributed* to Cyril Lucar, not as certainly his. The Synod of Jassy, at which Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kief (1632—1647), was present, is of importance, for the sanction which it gave to his *Confession*, rather than for its condemnation of the *Confession* attributed to Cyril Lucar.

Peter Mogila, a member of a noble family in Moldavia, having in his early years distinguished himself as a soldier, afterwards embraced the monastic life, and became Archimandrite of the Pechersky monastery; and in 1632 was consecrated Orthodox Metropolitan of Kief. It was the time when the Western part of Russia was troubled by the Unia, and a hostile feeling towards the Orthodox Church prevailed. When a Uniat monastery mutinied

[h] "Parthenio sedente celebrata synodus est in qua vox Μετουσίωσις ad Transubstantiationem Eucharisticam significandam approbata fuit." Le Quien, I. 336.

against his authority, the old soldier was ready to meet force by force; he buckled on his armour, and marching at the head of the military defeated the rebels.

The sturdy soldier received a theological education in the Sorbonne at Paris, and became a shining light in literature, and bulwark of Orthodoxy in the Greek Church; his principal work being *Ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς Καθολικῆς καὶ Ἀποστολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς.*

The *Orthodox Confession* was written at a time when the Church of Little Russia was infected by Calvinistic as well as Roman doctrine, with both of which Peter was tainted. The Synod of Jassy found in his *Confession* "many strange and unorthodox doctrines." After undergoing many alterations at the Synod, and having been translated into Greek by Meletius Syriga, Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople, it was put forth in 1662, (fifteen years therefore after Peter's death) with a Preface by Nectarius, Patriarch of Jerusalem; and with *The Answers of the Patriarch Jeremias*, and the *Eighteen Articles* of The Synod of Bethlehem, remains amongst the principal authoritative standards of the Greek Church in the present day.

We have now recorded the violent deaths of three Patriarchs of Constantinople in succession; to wade through the long series of depositions and murders that characterize the history of the Patriarchs of Constantinople would be an unprofitable and revolting task. We will confine ourselves to the Patriarchs between this time and the end of the Century. Next to Parthenius I. followed Parthenius II., who was strangled in 1650. Then followed (Joannicus II. intervening) Parthenius III., who, on a false accusation, of which he proved his innocence before the Vizier, was hung in 1657, his body, after

hanging three days, being cast into the sea. Gabriel, the next Patriarch, was falsely accused by the Jews of having been bribed to baptize a Jewish Turk, and was hung. Of the remaining Patriarchs, Joannicus III., Parthenius IV., and Dionysius III., the first twice, the last two five times, were seated on the Patriarchal throne, Dionysius being restored for the last time in 1693.

About thirty years after the Synod of Jassy a controversy with regard to Transubstantiation arose in the Gallican Church between the Calvinists, under John Claude, and the Jansenists, under Antony Arnaud, the life-long opponent of the Jesuits; the former maintaining that it is a modern doctrine; the latter that it was received in the Church in the earliest ages; both claiming to be in agreement with the Greek Church. The controversy is supposed to have been the occasion of the famous Synod of Bethlehem, held by Dositheus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in 1672, the year of his accession, and convened by him at the request of M. de Nointel, the French ambassador at Constantinople.

The Synod of Bethlehem condemned the *Confession*, but asserted that it was not the work of Cyril Lucar, but a Protestant forgery palmed off on him, to give it a show of authority. It thus cleared the head of the Orthodox Church of heresy, and only blamed Cyril on the ground that he had not as Patriarch anathematized Calvinism.

If Cyril Lucar leaned towards Calvinism, Dositheus, a learned and strictly Orthodox prelate, in his zeal to condemn Calvinism, leaned towards Latinism. The object of the Synod of Bethlehem was not to defend the Greek Church against Latinism but against Calvinism, and it incautiously fell into Latinism.

The synod endorsed Mogila's *Confession*, but, drawn

probably by de Noailles (whom Dositheus had met at Constantinople) and the Port-Royalists, towards Roman against Calvinistic doctrine, it went beyond the synod of Jassy, and gave its authority to the full doctrine of Transubstantiation, the accidents as well as the essence [1].

Of the XVIII. Articles of the Synod, the XVIIth relates to the *Μετουσίωσις*; the XVIIIth to the Intermediate State. The Greek Church does not hold a Purgatorial fire; but if the XVIIIth Article is to be taken as the sole authority, the difference between the Latin and Greek doctrine is otherwise little more than verbal. The doctrine as expressed in the XVIIIth Article is:—"We believe the souls of the deceased are either in rest or in torment; because immediately they have left their bodies they are carried to the place of joy or of sorrow and lamentation, although they receive not the completion of their happiness or damnation." This will only be at the general Resurrection. Such as have begun in life their repentance, but have not brought forth works meet for repentance, are carried to Hades, where they are relieved by prayers and alms of the faithful, particularly the unbloody sacrifice, and eventually "freed from their pains before the general Resurrection and universal judgment."

Compare this with the Roman doctrine as laid down at the Council of Trent:—"The souls there (in Purgatory) detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful;" and the Trent Catechism:—"A Purgatorial fire, in which the souls of the pious, tormented for a fixed period, are cleansed, that an entrance may be opened to them into their eternal home."

[1] For fuller account of the Synod of Bethlehem, see Introduction, p. 21.

The friendly intercourse between the Greek and Anglican Churches renewed by Cyril Lucar was, after the Rebellion, continued by the Anglican, and reciprocated by the Greek, Church. We read in his *Life and Correspondence* that Dr. Isaac Basire, who had been Chaplain to King Charles I. and Morton (the afterwards deprived), bishop of Durham, having been himself deprived at the Rebellion of his Prebendal stall and Archdeaconry, went to the Morea, where the Metropolitan of Achaia pressed him to preach on two occasions to his assembled Suffragans and clergy. He next went to Palestine, where Paisius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, expressed to him his desire for Communion with the old Church of England, and gave him, as he expresses it, "his Bull or Patriarchal Seal in blank (which is their way of credence) besides many other respects." Whilst acting as English Chaplain at Constantinople he frequently preached in Greek churches; and during his travels in the East he availed himself of the opportunity to explain to the Greeks the catholic character of the Anglican Church; and he enlisted the hearty approval by the four Patriarchs of our Church Catechism.

In 1661, the year in which Dr. Basire was recalled to England to act as Chaplain to Charles II., Sir Paul Ricaut was appointed Secretary to the English Embassy at Constantinople, where, in 1670, he wrote his *State of the Ottoman Empire.* He was next appointed Consul at Smyrna, where, by command of Charles II., he composed his work, *The present State of the Greek and Armenian Churches*, published in 1679.

Dr. Basire was followed at Constantinople by two learned Anglican chaplains; in 1668 by Dr. Thomas Smith, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who was

deprived at the Revolution; and in 1670 by Dr. Covel, Fellow, and afterwards (1688—1722) Master, of Christ's College, Cambridge. The former published in 1676 a small work entitled *De Græcæ Ecclesiæ hodierno statu*, and in 1680 an English edition; whilst Dr. Covel published, shortly before his death in 1722, a valuable folio work, not in appreciative terms, entitled *Some Account of the Greek Church.*

An interesting movement was set on foot at the end of the seventeenth century for the education at Oxford of twenty Greek youths in the College then called Glocester Hall, and now Worcester College, to which it was proposed to give the name of Greek College. They were to be supplied for five years with rooms, board, clothes, and medicine, as well as education, free of charge. The proposer of the College was Joseph Georgirenes, Metropolitan of Samos, who, having been expelled from his see by the Turks, settled in London; where was built for his services, in the then aristocratic quarter of Soho, the first Greek Church erected in England. Compton who, as Bishop of London, was Metropolitan of the transmarine possessions of England, greatly interested himself in the affairs of the Greek Church. Dr. Woodroffe, Canon of Christ Church, the Provost appointed, wrote in his own and Compton's name to Callinicus, Patriarch of Constantinople, that the College was meant to be a return, on the part of "lovers of Greece," for what they had received from that country in education, and "the Evangelical Word and Wisdom of God." Nothing, it was felt, would so tend towards the re-union of Christendom as the approximation of the Greek and Anglican Churches; but at Rome the College was viewed with jealousy; Louis XIV. bribed the students with the offer of greater advan-

tages to Paris; a rival seminary was established at Halle in Saxony; Roman agents tried to proselytize the students; the Greek Church forbade young men to go to Oxford; and in 1705 the College, partly owing to the irregularities of the Greek students themselves, came to an end.

In the early years of the eighteenth century an interesting attempt, but of which the importance was greatly overrated, was made by a small section of Anglicans, known as Non-jurors, who, finding themselves cut off from intercourse with their own, sought to promote union with the Greek, Church. When M. Mouravief, the historian of the Russian Church and, at one time, Under-Procurator of the Holy Governing Synod, asserts that it was carried on by the Anglican bishops, he entirely misunderstands or misstates the matter. It is therefore necessary, with the view to any future movement which may be made, to mention the circumstances which gave rise to the correspondence between the English Non-jurors and the Eastern Patriarchs.

On February 1, 1690, six prelates, the most considerable of whom were Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, refusing, whilst King James II. was alive, to take the oaths (whence they were called Non-jurors) to William and Mary, were, together with some laymen and about four hundred of the other clergy deposed, and, in 1694, created two suffragan bishops for their party. With the death of King James in 1701, the raison d'être of the schism terminated, and by the death of Ken in 1711 the first generation of Non-jurors came to an end. But so far from the schism ending, a second generation of Non-jurors arose, who obtained for their bishops consecration from the Scottish Church.

On the resignation of Gerasimus II., the aged Patriarch of Alexandria, to end his days on Mount Athos, a schism arose out of a double election of his successor, the Church electing the Archbishop of Lybia, the Sultan being induced by a large bribe to appoint the Archbishop of Sinai; in 1713 Arsenius, Archbishop of Thebais, accompanied by the Protosyncellus of Alexandria, arrived in England in quest of pecuniary assistance. The Non-jurors, styling themselves the *Catholic Remnant of the British Churches*, seized the opportunity of his presence in London to open, in 1716, through the Tsar Peter the Great, who greatly interested himself in the movement, a correspondence with the Eastern Patriarchs; and, on October 8, 1717, they indited a letter to the Tsar, requesting him to forward the Articles of their proposal to the four Patriarchs.

We are not concerned here as to whether the Non-juring schism was justifiable or not, but only with its dealings with the Greek Church. The knowledge which the Non-jurors possessed of the Fathers, and of ancient Liturgies and Ritual, so far fitted them for their task; but they were wholly ignorant of the character of the Greek Church; one of them, at a preliminary meeting, professing his ignorance of its doctrines and ritual; another asserting that the Greek Church was more bigoted and corrupt than the Roman. The arguments which they used were not such as would be adopted in the present day, to promote the cause of union. They magnified difficulties and differences which either do not exist, or could either be easily adjusted; they talked of "some concession on both sides" in essential matters, in which neither the Greek nor Anglican Church would tolerate a compromise; by claiming precedence for the Patri-

arch of Jerusalem, they showed not only an ignorance of Greek character, but a disregard of the Œcumenical Councils, opposed to all Anglican tradition.

One of them (Jeremy Collier, the historian) styled himself *Primus Anglo-Britanniæ Episcopus*, as if there were no Archbishop of Canterbury; and there is no doubt that the Greek Patriarchs were deceived into the belief that they were corresponding with authorized representatives of the Anglican Church.

Nor was it a time when the Greek Church was in a position to be adequately represented. Latinism obscured Greek Orthodoxy, and had lately received the sanction of the Synod of Bethlehem. The correspondence shows how the Patriarchs, frightened by the *Confession* ascribed to Cyril Lucar, scented everywhere Lutheranism and Calvinism; it breathes the sentiment common amongst Greeks, except persons of education, at the present day, that orthodoxy is confined to the Eastern Church; and, without a shadow of reason, the Greek Patriarchs accused the British with being Luthero-Calvinists.

The insignificance of the Non-juring movement, as far as the Anglican Church was concerned, may be conjectured from the fact that Archbishop Wake, for the nine years that he had held the Primacy of Canterbury, had heard nothing of it. As soon as he was informed of it in 1724, he wrote to Chrysanthus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, exposing the schismatical character of the whole proceeding, on the part of a small section, writing under the fictitious character of Metropolitans and Bishops of the Anglican Church. On his representation the movement at once collapsed. Archbishop Wake was one of the greatest of the Archbishops of Canterbury; and the concluding words of his letter express the feeling which

then and always has existed on the part of the Anglican towards the Greek Church; "We, the true bishops and clergy of the Church of England, as in every fundamental article we profess the same faith with you, shall not cease, at least in spirit and effect, (for otherwise, owing to our distance from you, we cannot), to hold Communion with you, and to pray for your peace and happiness."

PART II.

The Greco-Russian Church.

CHAPTER I.

The Building up of the Russian Church.

Since the Great Schism ecclesiastical history is mostly confined to writers of the Roman Communion; and as they interested themselves but little about what they considered a schismatical body, little is heard about the Eastern Church. That Church stood isolated; and as, owing to Turkish oppression, it decreased, so the Roman Church increased, in influence; and the Pope of Rome became more and more the moderator and director of the affairs of Christendom.

The conversion of Russia, the greatest conquest which the Christian Church has ever made since the time of the Apostles, was effected by the Greek Church shortly before the schism commenced; and, though Russia had to go through the fiery trial of affliction and well-nigh political extinction, its Church was all along laying the foundation of Russia's greatness; whilst it was itself rising by degrees to the place it now holds, as ecclesiastically under the primacy given to the Œcumenical see of Constantinople by the great Councils, but practically the head of the Orthodox Greek Church.

The earliest history of Russia centres round Kief and Novgorod. St. Andrew's Church at Kief commemorates a traditional visit of that Apostle to the country. How-

ever that may be, we are told by Nestor, the monk-historian of the Pechersky monastery, who stands in much the same relation to the Russian, that the Venerable Bede stands to the Anglican, Church, that, A.D. 862, certain Slavic and other tribes of the country now called Russia, being at war with each other, and unable to govern themselves, agreed to send over the sea to the Varangian Rus, saying; "Our land is large and rich, but there is no order in it; come ye, and rule and reign over us. And three brothers were chosen, with their whole clan, and they took with them all the Rus and came."

The country, whilst it retained its own language, took the name of the new comers (or probably conquerors); and Ruric, the eldest of the brothers, assumed the government with the title of Veliki Kniaz (*Grand Prince*), making Novgorod his capital. The name Novgorod (*New Town*) implies the existence of an older town, Kief, which Askold and Dir, two of Ruric's companions, proceeding southwards, conquered. Thus Ruric was the founder of the Russian monarchy, and from him dates the commencement of what developed into the great Russian Empire.

Before long the Russian power entered into commercial relations with Constantinople, and at that early date the long-standing antagonism between Russia and Constantinople commenced. In 860 a naval expedition under Askold and Dir sailed down the Dnieper (the ancient Borysthenes), and appeared under the walls of Constantinople. Tradition relates how the capital was only saved by a miracle, the Patriarch Photius throwing into the sea the robe of the Mother of God; suddenly a storm overwhelmed the ships of their opponents; the grateful citizens ascribed their deliverance to the Mother of God;

and Askold and Dir, recognizing the hand of God, became the first-fruit of Christianity to the Russian people. After their return home they sowed the seeds of Christianity at Kief; there a Christian church was built; a bishop was sent by Ignatius, the restored Patriarch of Constantinople; and Christianity, if it did not at the time take deep root, yet, kept alive by their merchants in their commercial relations with Constantinople, never afterwards died out.

After the death of Ruric, A.D. 879, his brother, Oleg, was appointed regent during the minority of Ruric's son, Igor; but he continued to govern the kingdom till, after having effected a commercial treaty with Constantinople in 912, he died in the following year. Igor, who had married a Scandinavian lady of great beauty named Olga, then entered upon his inheritance. In 941, and again in 945, he attacked Constantinople, and, whatever may have been the result of the expeditions, it is certain that a treaty of peace between the two countries was concluded in 945. On his return to Russia, Igor was, in the same year, murdered by his rebellious subjects; when Olga administered the kingdom during the minority of her son, Sviatislaf I. (945—972).

In the latter year Olga went on a voyage to Constantinople, with the view of obtaining a knowledge of the true God, of whom she had heard through the little Christian community at Kief; and there, after being instructed in the faith of the Greek Church, and living in fasting and prayer and almsgiving, she, together with her retinue, was baptized by the Patriarch Polyeuktes; the Patriarch dismissing her with his blessing, "Blessed art thou amongst Russian women; from generation to generation the Russian people shall call thee blessed."

Olga, whom Nestor calls "the morning-star which precedes the sun; the twilight, the dawn which heralds the day," took with her from Constantinople to Russia a Greek Priest; thenceforward she was enthusiastic in spreading Christianity; and it was through her influence with her heathen son, Sviatislaf, that her grandson, Vladimir, was educated in the doctrines of the Orthodox Church. In 967 she died at the age of eighty-five, and she, who in her life was surnamed the Wise, was afterwards canonized as a Saint in the Russian Church.

Sviatislaf, having effected the conquest of Bulgaria, turned his thoughts to the conquest of Constantinople; but, in 972, he suffered a disastrous defeat from the Eastern Emperor, John Zimisces. In his retreat to Russia, he was defeated and slain by the Pechenegs, having just before given an order for a general massacre of the Christians, to his toleration of whom he attributed the wrath of the gods and his defeat in battle.

In 980 his son, Vladimir I., having assassinated his elder brother, Yaropolk, ascended the throne (980—1015). In his adventurous and stormy career, and the dissipation of his early life, Vladimir had forgotten the religious principles instilled into his mind by Olga, and even sacrificed Christian victims to the Pagan gods. In this manner suffered two Varangians, Feodor and his son Ivan, who have ever since been honoured as Saints and Martyrs of the Russian Church.

But all the while the instructions of Olga were doing their silent work, and it gradually became evident that Vladimir was not at heart a Pagan. In vain Mahometans, and Jews, and Roman Catholics endeavoured to draw him to their religion; Olga had engaged his affection for the Greek Church. A philosopher from Greece, a monk

named Constantine, impressed on him the falseness of Paganism, the truth of redemption of the world by the Saviour, of a future retribution of good and evil. Vladimir was moved ; he loaded him with gifts and dismissed him. He resolved to despatch messengers to examine the various religious systems of the world. They visited Mussulman, Jewish, and Roman Churches ; but when they arrived at Constantinople, and the Patriarch himself celebrated in St. Sophia's the Eucharist with all the magnificence of the Greek ritual, so struck were they with the splendour of the ceremonial, and so persuaded of the truth of the Orthodox faith, that they were already Christians in heart. "When we stood in the Temple," they said, "we did not know whether we were not in Heaven ; for there is nothing like it on earth. There in truth God has His dwelling with men, and we can never forget the beauty we saw there, nor can we any longer abide in heathenism."

The Boyars impressed on Vladimir the faith of the Greek Church as being the best, otherwise Olga, who was the wisest of women, would not have adopted it. Vladimir's doubts were now removed, but he still hesitated to receive Baptism. Since the defeat of Sviatislaf, there had been peace between Russia and Constantinople. Vladimir, having now embarked on an expedition against the Greek city of Cherson (*Sebastopol*), vowed that if he were successful in battle he would become a Christian. Having gained the victory he demanded in marriage the hand of Anna, the sister of the Emperors, Basil, the famous Bulgaroktonos, and Constantine, threatening that a refusal would be followed by an attack on Constantinople. To the condition that he should be baptized, imposed by the Emperor Basil, he replied, that he had long ex-

amined and conceived a love for the Greek law. For the good of the Church the pious Princess accepted the barbarian fratricide; and in 988, in the Church of the Panagia, the most holy Mother of God, the Baptism and Marriage of Vladimir, who took the Greek name of Basil, were on one and the same day celebrated by the bishop of Cherson.

"The first impulse in a Russian's heart," says the author of *Free Russia*, "is duty to God—all public events are celebrated by the building of a church." Vladimir inaugurated the practice by building a church at Cherson, which he dedicated, after his baptismal name, to St. Basil; and on his return to Kief, taking with him the celebrated "Lady of Vladimir," the most highly venerated image in Russia, now in the Church of the Assumption at Moscow, and accompanied by Greek bishops, and priests, and deacons, and a Syrian priest named Michael, he caused his twelve sons to be baptized. Perun, the god of thunder, was thrown into the Dnieper; the Court and the Boyars and all the multitude of the people flocked to the river, and received Baptism from the Greek priests and deacons; "on that day," says Nestor, "the Heavens and the earth rejoiced."

The conversion of nations in the Middle Ages was generally effected through the instrumentality of the King, or chieftain of the country; "All Kings shall fall down before Him, all nations shall do Him homage;" such is the inscrutable plan of Providence. Vladimir was the Ethelbert of Russia; on June 1, Ethelbert, the most powerful King in the Saxon Heptarchy, was baptized; on the following Christmas Day, Pope Gregory I. was able to announce to the Patriarch of Constantinople that 10,000 converts to Christianity had been made in England.

One day, says Nestor, Vladimir was a Pagan, directly afterwards he became an Apostle, and the whole nation received the Gospel, as if prepared through the instructions of an Apostle. Many causes conduced to prepare the soil in Russia. There was the commercial intercourse of the Russian Slavs with Constantinople; there was the little church at Kief; there was the example and influence of Olga the Wise, and there was the enthusiasm of Vladimir's mission to Constantinople. How deeply rooted Christianity became, is learnt from the fact that two sons of Vladimir gave their lives for the faith; and there is this fact that, unlike other countries in which Paganism afterwards re-asserted itself, in Russia, after its conversion, the Orthodox faith was unassailable. The system adopted by Cyril and Methodius was that followed in Russia; Greek missionaries, acting as the servants of the Cross, claiming supremacy for none but Christ alone, preached to the people in their own language, the language in which, says Nestor, the Slavs rejoice to have the greatness of God preached to them.

The Russian historian Karamsin compares Vladimir to Charlemagne, in his zeal for Christianity and his love of knowledge. The Russian nation conferred on him the title of Great, the Russian Church that of Saint. After his conversion, Vladimir's character was completely changed. He accompanied the bishops in their missionary tours; under his direction schools were established and organized, Greek teachers set over them, Greek and Latin taught, and the doctrine and principles of the Orthodox Church inculcated. He built several churches, for which he employed Greek architects and painters, with schools and monasteries and seminaries for priests. The Liturgical language of the Churches was the "old

Slavic" language of Cyril and Methodius, the same that is the language of the Russian Church at the present day.

Under Vladimir, the Greco-Russian Church entered on its first, which may be called the Byzantine, stage, when it was wholly subject to the Patriarchs of Constantinople. Kief was the first Metropolitan see, for which Vladimir built the Cathedral of stone, endowing it with the tenth of his property (whence it was called *the Cathedral of the Tithes*), and dedicating it to the Most Holy Virgin, Michael the Syrian being appointed first bishop. The next bishop of Kief, sent into Russia by the Patriarch Nicolas, was Leontius, a Greek, by whom the Cathedral was consecrated. The third bishop was John or Ivan, sent from Constantinople in 1011.

Thus the Russian Church was firmly established, and was wholly the daughter of the Greek Church. With Christianity civilization dawned on the land ; and Russia, which had been before steeped in gross ignorance and material Paganism, was brought into the comity of the other nations of Christendom. Vladimir equal to the Apostles (Ἰσαπόστολος), as the people called him, died in 1015, and was buried by Ivan in the Cathedral at Kief. There also Queen Anna, who predeceased him, was buried ; and thither the bones of Olga were translated.

After the death of Vladimir Kief was seized by his nephew, Sviatopolk (1016—1019), who signalised his short reign by the murder of Vladimir's two sons, Boris and Gleb, whose lives and miracles are recorded by Nestor, and whom the Russian Church numbers amongst its Saints. He was driven out by another of Vladimir's sons, Yaroslaf I., Prince of Novgorod, who then held the whole Kingdom under his sole government till 1054.

Yaroslaf was both a theologian and a legislator, and to him Russia is indebted for its first code of laws, the Russkaya Pravda (*Russian Verity*), and through him the Greek Nomo-canon, which had been systematized by John Scholasticus in the sixth century, and more recently in the ninth century, was translated into Russian.

By his son Vladimir the Cathedral of Novgorod, and the magnificent monastery of St. George, the patron Saint of Slavic nations in general, and of Novgorod in particular, was founded, and dedicated by Luke, bishop of the see. Yaroslaf continued the good work begun by his father, building churches, monasteries, and schools; and as we learn from Nestor, in the schools of Vladimir and Yaroslaf, the Bible, translated by Cyril and Methodius, formed an important element of instruction. The Pechersky monastery [a] founded in the reign of Yaroslaf, was the birth-place of Russian literature, and a training-school for the clergy. Himself well-stored with the works of the Greek Church, Yaroslaf caused many of them to be translated into Russian, and circulated through his dominions. The piety and learning of Vladimir and Yaroslaf penetrated the national life; and to them is attributed the culture which continued to characterize Russia, till all was swept away in the terrible Mongol invasions.

[a] See next Chapter.

CHAPTER II.

The Russian Church under Metropolitans.

The fourth bishop of Kief, the first whom Nestor dignifies with the title of Metropolitan, was Theopemptus (*Θεὸς πεμπτός* ; *sent by God*) (1037—1057), as his name implies, a Greek, sent into Russia by Alexius, the predecessor of Michael Cerularius in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The famous XXVIIIth canon of Chalcedon thus enacted ;—"The Archbishop of Constantinople shall ordain the Metropolitans, after the elections have been first made and reported to them." It was the almost invariable custom in the Russian Church at this period, for the Metropolitans to be by birth and education Greeks, and to be consecrated by the Patriarchs of Constantinople. This custom continued till the time of the Mongol invasions, when, communication being difficult and less frequent than before, the Metropolitans were generally chosen in Russia, and sent to Constantinople for consecration. That the office was one of great consideration may be inferred from the fact that the Patriarchs attached a leaden seal, as was usual in communicating with Princes and independent Prelates, instead of the ordinary wax seal, to the letters which they addressed to them.

An exception to the general rule was made in the case of the next Metropolitan, Hilarion (1051—1065), a monk, who was consecrated Metropolitan in a synod of Russian bishops; but, says Mouravief, this infraction was speedily made good by a benedictory letter which Hilarion received from the Patriarch Michael Cerularius.

Although several monasteries already existed in the

country, Hilarion is the reputed founder of Russian monasticism. Mouravief draws attention to the remarkable recurrence in Russia of the names of the three famous hermits who were the pioneers of monasticism in Egypt and Palestine, Hilarion, Antony, and Theodosius. In the reign of Isiaslaf I., Antony, a monk of Mount Athos, built at Kief the famous Pechersky monastery, on the site which Hilarion had excavated, but which had remained untenanted since he became Metropolitan. Antony, refusing the post himself, appointed Barlaam as the first Hegumen, whose successor, St. Theodosius, the friend of Nestor, gave it the strict rule, followed in the monastery of Studium at Constantinople.

Yaroslaf was succeeded by his son Isiaslaf I. (1054—1078), who entered on the Grand Princedom in the year of the commencement of the schism between the Eastern and Western Churches. The schism was only eleven years old when Yury or George, the successor of Hilarion, was consecrated Metropolitan of Kief (1065 — 1079), several of whose works show how the Russian Church made common cause with the Patriarch of Constantinople. Leontius, the second bishop of Kief, condemned the Latin azyms; St. Theodosius, the famous Hegumen of the Pechersky, accused the Latins of eating meat on the first Tuesday in Lent; he also condemned mixed marriages between the Orthodox and Catholics. The Metropolitan Yury wrote "A Discourse," in which he brought seventy accusations against the Roman Church; as "she refused to renounce the errors into which she had fallen, it was," he said, "necessary to break with her." The reign of Isiaslaf was memorable for the first of the many futile attacks made by Rome on the independence of the Russian Church.

Disastrous times had come upon Russia owing to the fatal system of Appanages, by which the Grand Princes parcelled out their hereditary fiefs amongst their numerous legitimate and illegitimate offspring. From the reign of Isiaslaf to the year of the commencement of the Mongol invasions, the civil historians of Russia lament that, except the uninteresting feuds of the appanaged Princes, there is next to nothing to relate. Still the history of the Russian Church at that period has a peculiar interest; the Princes styled the Metropolitans their *Fathers;* the Church was often the successful mediator, and sealed the treaties which the Princes made with each other; and to its Metropolitans and bishops Russia owes, if not its salvation, at any rate its coherence during and after those stormy times.

Russia was now not only exposed to such a feud between Isiaslaf and his brethren, but also to an invasion of Boleslaf, King of Poland. The Metropolitan Yury does not appear to have been equal to the occasion, but fled in terror to Constantinople. Isiaslaf, deprived of his throne by the Vetché, sent his son to Rome, in 1075, to seek the intervention of Gregory VII., who was then Pope (1073—1085). The Pope (to quote the French translation of Karamsin) "pretendait devenir le chef de la monarchie universelle;" he now caught at the opportunity of severing Russia from the Greek Church; he offered military aid, on the condition of Russia becoming a fief of Rome; and promised to confer the Russian throne, after Isiaslaf's death, on his son, "dono sancti Petri." Isiaslaf, succeeding in recovering the throne without the Pope's help, the negotiations fell to the ground.

In 1078, Gregory made an attack on the independence

of the Greek Church, and excommunicated the Eastern Emperor, Nicephorus III.

The Metropolitan Yury was succeeded by Ivan II. (1080—1088). In the year of his consecration a schism, which lasted twenty years, broke out in the Church of Rome, Gregory VII. being Pope till 1085, and Clement III. (*Wibert*) Anti-Pope (1080—1100). Ivan wrote to Clement enumerating six deviations from the faith, on the part of the Latins;—(1) Fasting on Saturdays; (2) not fasting during the first week of the Great Lent; (3) the celibacy of the clergy; (4) their difference on the Sacrament of Unction; (5) the addition of the Filioque; (6) unleavened bread in the Eucharist. All these practices, he told him, were opposed to the Seven General Councils; and he advised him to consult the Patriarch of Constantinople, as "having the Word of Life, and being a light placed in the World."

The Orthodox Greek, and not least the Russian, Church generally observed toleration towards other Churches; but the feeling of the Russians toward the Roman Church after the schism was much embittered. Successive Metropolitans declared that it had fallen from the right faith; and exhorted the Princes to have nothing to do with the Latins; not to allow their subjects to marry, or even to sit at the same table, with them. The Metropolitan Nicephorus (1104—1121) wrote to Vladimir II. (*Monomach*): "the Holy Œcumenical Church does not hold Communion with the Latin Church, and has cast it off like a gangrened member, whom the whole Church has rejected; we Orthodox Christians ought not to eat or drink, or associate with the partizans of the Pope."

In the reign of Vladimir II., Russia, by the marriage of the Grand Prince with Gytha, daughter of our English

Harold, slain at the Battle of Hastings, was, for the first time, brought into connexion with England. Vladimir and Nicephorus are described as models, the one on the Kingly the other on the Episcopal throne, and the latter succeeded as peace-maker in suppressing the civil wars, and uniting the Princes of the appanages in a common cause.

The importance of "Holy Kief" at this time may be estimated from the number and splendour of its churches and chapels. Nestor places the number at 700, which may be accounted for by the fact that it was considered a meritorious act of faith to erect public and private chapels. Under the Metropolitan Nicetas (1121—1126) Kief was visited by a terrible fire, which laid the city in ruins and destroyed nearly all its churches; Monomach, shortly before the conflagration, having founded in Suzdal the city, called after him, Vladimir. After the death of Vladimir the old state of anarchy revived at Kief; new Principalities arose, and in the course of thirty-two years no fewer than eleven Princes occupied the throne of Kief; the Capital declined and fell into insignificance; and the Grand Princedom was reduced to little beyond a name.

The disastrous contentions of the Princes bring us into contact with a prominent name, that of Niphont, bishop of the powerful Principality of Novgorod. On the death of the Metropolitan, Michael II., the successor of Nicetas, Clement was, during a vacancy of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, elected Metropolitan in a synod of Russian bishops, in 1197, a proposal being made that, as a substitute for the Patriarch, the hand of St. Clement of Rome, whose remains were supposed to be at Kief, should be laid upon him. This proposal found

only one opponent, Niphont, who was afterwards added to the catalogue of Russian Saints as the Defender of Russia, but was now, by order of the Grand Prince Isiaslaf II. (1146—1154), consigned to the Pechersky monastery. On the deposition of Isiaslaf, St. Niphont was recalled by his successor Yury Dolgorouky (*long-armed*), Clement being deposed, and the clergy ordained by him suspended; and Constantine, bishop of Chernigof, was consecrated by Luke Chrysoberges (1155—1169), the newly elected Patriarch of Constantinople; but before his arrival in Russia, Niphont was dead. Another revolution placed Mistislaf, the son of Isiaslaf, on the throne; Constantine was then deposed, and Theodore consecrated by Luke. So that there were now at one and the same time three Metropolitans of Kief.

In 1155 Yury Dolgorouki recovered the Grand Princedom, which he now held till his death in 1157. Yury did much for the improvement of his patrimony of Suzdal; and was also the founder of Moscow. After the death of Yury, whilst Suzdal went on increasing, confusion, if possible, worse confounded, went on at Kief; till in 1169 Andrew Bogoliupski, Prince of Suzdal and son of Yury, through a coalition of the Princes, gained the Grand Princedom.

Thinking that the throne of Kief was the cause of all the calamities which beset Russia, Andrew determined to strike at the root of the evil; he attacked and took Kief, and reduced it to a fief. The victors, says Karamsin, forgot that they were Russians. During a three days' siege the monastery and churches and the Cathedral were all given over to pillage; the precious images, the sacerdotal ornaments, the books, even the bells, were carried away.

The centre of Russia was now changed to Suzdal; Andrew made Vladimir the capital of his Princedom, and transferred from Kief the celebrated image of the Virgin to the Church of the Mother of God, which he built for its reception.

Thus fell "Holy Kief," the Russian annalists justifying the proceeding, on the ground that Kief paid the just penalty for having received the false doctrines of the Metropolitan Constantine; but the Patriarch, Luke Chrysoberges, refused the request of Andrew to transfer to Vladimir the Metropolitan see of Russia.

During the Latin Kingdom at Constantinople the Russian Church remained faithful to the Greek Empire and Greek Church; and in 1205 the Metropolitan, Cyril I., sought consecration from the head of the Orthodox Greek Church at Nicæa. But no sooner was the Latin Kingdom established than Pope Innocent III. sought an opportunity for claiming the allegiance of Russia. Roman (1188—1205), Grand Prince of Galich in Red Russia, (for since the fall of Kief several Princes laid claim to that previously unique title) was one of the most powerful of the Princes. The Pope's legate, says Karamsin, first pointed out to him the superiority of the Roman over the Greek Church, until, worsted in argument by Roman, he tried to bribe him with the offer of the sword of St. Peter, if he would adopt the Roman faith. "Has the Pope a sword like this?" asked Roman, showing his own sword; "and did not the Saviour tell St. Peter to put up his sword within his sheath?" In 1205, however, Roman being defeated on the Vistula and slain by the Poles, who were members of the Roman Church, a Uniat Church was set up in Galich; and what was the consequence? Galich became the prey of civil

war; in 1218 it was taken by Novgorod, and the Roman clergy were driven out of the country; but Novgorod itself being at war with the Knights of the Sword (*Ordo Militum Ensiferorum*), a German Order established, A.D. 1201, by direction of Pope Innocent III., the Romanists were again enabled to establish themselves in the country. Galich was, however, a thorn in the flesh of the Popes. Innocent IV. (1243—1254), conscious of the oppressed state of Russia, sent to his "dear son" Daniel, the son and successor of Roman, a present of a royal crown, with a proposal for a union of the Churches on the Uniat system. Daniel replied that union could only be effected through an Œcumenical Council; and so objectionable at Rome was his conduct that Pope Alexander IV. (1254—1261), the successor of Innocent, complaining that he had broken all his promises, threatened him with divine judgment.

In 1221 the Mongols, under Genghis Khan, taking advantage of the dissensions of the Princes, began their attacks upon disunited and enfeebled Russia; and in 1224 the Russians suffered a disastrous defeat in a sanguinary battle on the river Kalka. Suddenly and unexpectedly the Mongols stopped and returned to their Asiatic homes; to recommence, however, their attacks in 1237 under Batou, the grandson of Genghis; and for 240 years (1237 — 1477) the land groaned under their oppression.

The invasions commenced at a time when, notwithstanding the contentions of the Princes, the Russian Church was in a highly efficient state. During the unhappy period of the Appanages, whilst the number of new sees which were erected was an evidence of its prosperity, the Russian Church was presided over by a sin-

gularly efficient succession of Metropolitans, who were the link which bound the nation together, a recognized part of whose duty it was to act as peacemakers. From the days of Vladimir and Yaroslaf national education had been a matter of paramount importance; schools had been everywhere established under Greek teachers sent from Constantinople; the circulation of the Bible in the Slavic translation of Cyril and Methodius was promoted by the Metropolitans and bishops as the basis of instruction; civilization had spread, and the Orthodox faith had been widely extended. By the Mongol invasions all these hopeful signs were swept away, and all attempts to diffuse knowledge arrested. The early promise of intellectual life and literary development were blasted; most of the translations of Cyril and Methodius were destroyed, and the work had to be done over again.

The Orthodox Church was much impeded in the sad havoc of the times; but the more they suffered, the greater was the attachment of the people to their Church; and in despair of human help they betook themselves to outward acts of contrition and penance. The Princes, whilst quarrelling amongst themselves, drew nearer to their Church and liberally distributed alms; many built monasteries in which they themselves might end their troubled lives; and so greatly did they multiply that it was said that more monasteries were built in Russia during the Mongol invasions than at any other period of its history.

This zeal for building monasteries the Metropolitans encouraged, and to its monasteries Russia at that time owed a deep debt of gratitude. Not only, when schools were everywhere destroyed, were they the only means of keeping learning from dying out; but they lent their

aid in constructing fortresses, in draining swamps, in making roads, and in such like useful works as the necessity of the time required.

This devotional spirit the Mongols, whilst still pagans, thought it to their interest to encourage. There was no religious persecution, and no Russians were compelled to abandon their faith. "Whosoever shall dare by act or word to prejudice the faith of the Russians shall be undeserving pardon and suffer death;" such was part of the Mongol law. By such treatment the Khans hoped to make the Orthodox Church their ally against the Princes; but the opposite result was effected; and in time it led to the unification of Russia. Whilst all was confusion in the State, in the Church there was union; and from there being one Metropolitan the Princes conceived the idea of national unity. The Metropolitans and bishops and clergy, whilst they viewed with disgust the favours of the Infidels, saw that the coalition of the Princes and the elevation of the Grand Princedom, was the surest way of driving the Mongols out of Russia; for this they watched the opportunity, and for this the Church educated the State.

During the Mongol invasions Russia had reason to be thankful to the able Metropolitans who presided over its Church; "to remember," says Mouravief, "with devout gratitude the defenders of her youth, especially and above all Cyril, Peter, Alexis, Cyprian, Jonah."

To return to the invasion of Russia under Batou. In 1237 Moscow was burnt. In the same year the Grand Principality of Vladimir was reduced to ashes, and the Grand Prince Yury II. killed; the Boyars and citizens taking refuge in the Church of Our Lady, where the bishop Metrophanes commended their souls to God,

were to a man piteously murdered. Tver was sacked, but its neighbour Novgorod escaped, the amazed citizens ascribing their deliverance to the intercession of the Saints and the prayers of the Church.

Batou again returned in 1240. In that year Chernigof was committed to the flames. In 1242 Kief was subdued; its Cathedral and noble churches and the Pechersky monastery were reduced to ashes, the Metropolitan Joseph perishing, as was supposed, in the flames.

From this time forward all Russia, except Novgorod, was a Mongol province; and in 1242 Batou built the city of Sarai, where he established the Empire of the Mongol Khans, whither the Russian Princes were obliged to bring in person their tribute, to do homage, and to purchase from the Khan the right of governing their Principalities.

Yury II. was succeeded in the Grand Princedom by his brother Yaroslaf II. (1238—1246), the father of two sons, Andrew (1246—1256), who was confirmed in the Grand Princedom of Kief by Batou; whilst the other son, the famous Alexander Nevski, reigned at Novgorod (1246—1260). Under the latter a gleam of hope dawned on the country; and he and his grandson, Dmitri Donskoi, are the two principal figures during the period of the national debasement.

In 1240 Alexander defeated the Swedes on the river Neva, from which event he gained the name of Nevski. Pope Gregory IX. (1227—1241) having proclaimed a Crusade against the Novgorodians for their opposition to the Knights of the Sword, the inveterate enemies of Orthodoxy, Nevski, nothing daunted, feeling that he was engaging in war for the Church, met the Western, with an Eastern, Crusade; and, having first received in the Church of St. Sophia, at Novgorod, the blessing of the

Archbishop Spiridion, set out against the army of Western Crusaders and gained a brilliant victory under the walls of Pscof.

After the death of the Metropolitan Joseph, owing to troubles at Constantinople under the Latin Government, Russia was left without a Metropolitan for ten years, when Cyril II. was elected (1250—1280), and received consecration from the Orthodox Patriarch, Manuel II., at Nicæa.

In 1251 Pope Innocent IV. sent to that staunch champion of Orthodoxy, Alexander Nevski, through two Cardinals, a Bull stating that his father, Yaroslaf, had been prevented by sudden death from joining the Roman Church, and requesting him to follow the pious intention of his father. "We Russians," was his reply, "follow the true doctrine of the Church, and desire neither to know nor follow yours." Though Novgorod was the only Principality which had preserved its independence, Nevski was obliged, like the other Princes, to go to Sarai and do homage to the Mongol Khan. Whilst returning from one of these visits he died; when his death was announced, it was said by a voice from heaven, to the Metropolitan Cyril, stopping in the midst of celebrating Mass, and turning to the people, Cyril exclaimed; "Know, my people, that the sun of Russia is set."

Cyril II. was Metropolitan through the reigns of Alexander Nevski, Yaroslaf III., and Basil I. The ravages of the Mongols had been attended with serious consequences to the Russian Church, and the number of its sees had been reduced from eighteen to five. Going about from city to city, Cyril threw life into the desolated churches; in compliance with the request of the Grand Prince Yaroslaf III., who had been Prince of Tver,

he established a bishopric in that city; he restored discipline, which in those stormy times had become sadly relaxed; in 1274 he held a Council at Vladimir against the widely prevalent simony; and he awed the turbulent citizens of Novgorod by threat of an interdict. Batou having founded the Golden Horde at Sarai, Cyril, finding that it was the necessary meeting-place of the Russian Princes, erected, in 1261, under Batou's successor, Berka, an episcopal see in the Mongol capital, and appointed Metrophanes its first bishop. So far from resenting the appointment of a Christian bishop, Mangou Temir, the next Khan, appointed Theophanes, the successor of Metrophanes, his envoy to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

For two years after the death of Cyril, owing to the deprivation of the Patriarch Joseph, and the intrusion of Veccus, by the Emperor Michael Palæologus, the Russian Church, refusing to hold relations with the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, remained without a Metropolitan. On the deposition of Veccus, and after the death of Michael, Maximus (1282—1308), a Greek, was elected, and received consecration from the restored Patriarch Joseph. In 1299 Maximus, finding Kief, which since its destruction presented only a shadow of its former self, ill-suited, removed the Metropolitan see to Vladimir, where his successor, St. Peter (1308—1328), a native of Volhynia, for a time continued it, though the Metropolitans continued to style themselves Metropolitans of Kief and All Russia.

Thus the Russian Church entered upon its second, which is called the Greco-Russian, stage; thenceforward, though its dependence on the Patriarchs of Constantinople continued, the Metropolitans were generally Russians,

elected by the clergy and confirmed in their office by the Sovereign.

During the thirteenth century "Holy Moscow" was an obscure and insignificant village of Suzdal. Daniel, son of St. Alexander Nevski, received it as his Appanage and raised it to a Principality. Ivan I. (1328—1341), the brother of Daniel, surnamed Kalita (*purse*) (as to whether because his purse was full or because it was an empty one, opinions differ), succeeded as Grand Master of both Vladimir and Moscow; and he so raised and embellished the latter Principality that, though Vladimir continued the nominal, Moscow became the real, capital of Russia.

The object of Ivan was, that which the Metropolitans had long at heart, and for which they had been steadily paving the way, the unification of the Appanages under the Grand Prince; with a view to which he proposed to Peter the removal of the Metropolitan see from Vladimir to Moscow. Peter, recognizing the growing importance of Moscow, and that it was becoming the centre of the Principalities, lent a ready ear to the proposal, making it a condition that Ivan should build to the glory of the Blessed Virgin the Church of the Assumption. Thus to Peter is due the origin of the Church in which the successors of Ivan, now the Tsars of All the Russias, have ever since his time been crowned.

Theognostes (1328—1353), the successor of St. Peter, was, as his name implies (*Θεὸς γνωστός*), a Greek. Feeling that the unity of the Principalities under the Grand Prince would be as beneficial to the Church as to the State, he, together with the clergy, heartily co-operated with Ivan; with the paramount civil authority the head of the Church was identified, and Church and State in Russia became one, under different aspects. And at the

very time that this union was effected, the Mongols became disunited, and split up into several Khanates, a prey to civil war, which undermined the supreme authority.

Whilst Theognostes was Metropolitan, the holy hermit Sergius, or Bartholomew (to call him by his birth-name), (1315—1392; canonized 1428), a native of Rostof, the bearer of a name dear to every Russian heart, founded in the woods near Moscow the Troitza (*Trinity*) monastery, the richest and most venerated of the religious houses in Russia. One of the freaks of Ivan *the Terrible* led him to endow it with immense possessions; so great was its wealth that it was thought prudent to surround it with a wall 1,500 yards in circumference, with a triple row of embrasures, flanked with nine towers; which enabled its monks to withstand an attack of the second false Dmitri, and to accommodate all the Muscovites that flocked into it during the French invasion of 1812; in the present day it incloses within its walls a University and twelve Churches. Theognostes having been, together with Simeon Gordii (*the proud*, 1341—1353), the son and successor of Ivan as Grand Prince, and Basil, Archbishop of Novgorod, carried off by the Black Plague, was succeeded by St. Alexis (1353—1377), bishop of Vladimir and a scion of a noble Russian family. When under the weak rule of Ivan II. (1353—1359) Russia fell back into its former anarchy, Alexis took the helm; and when again, after Ivan's death, the Grand Princedom was threatened by the house of Suzdal, it was Alexis who saved the supremacy of Moscow.

To Alexis the building of the magnificent Choudof monastery within the Kremlin, and the rebuilding of the Pechersky which had been destroyed by Batou, are

due; and he and his penultimate predecessor, Peter, are amongst the Saints of the Russian Church.

Ivan II. was succeeded by his son Dmitri (1362—1389). Alexis wished St. Sergius to succeed him as Metropolitan; but Sergius being unwilling to leave his monastery, Cyprian, a native of Servia, and a learned man, received consecration at Constantinople (1377—1407). But Michael, Dmitri's Confessor and Keeper of the Seals, having gained the ear of the Grand Prince, was despatched to Constantinople for consecration, being entrusted with a blank document signed by Dmitri, to be filled in according to his requirements. Michael having died at sea, not without suspicion of treachery, Pimen, Archimandrite of the Pechersky monastery, who was one of the train which accompanied Michael, was elected by the Boyars, who turned the Grand Prince's blank space to their own purpose, and, at the cost of 20,000 roubles, obtained the consecration of Pimen. This proceeding not recommending itself to Dmitri, Pymen was publicly degraded, and Cyprian remained Metropolitan till his death, A.D. 1407. But, says Plato, this was one of many similar transactions which created in Russia a desire to be independent of Constantinople.

In 1380 Dmitri, having gone to the war with the benediction of the saintly Sergius, gained the important victory over the Mongol Khan, Mamai, on the banks of the Don, from which the name of Donskoi was given him. This splendid victory was however counterbalanced two years later, when the Mongols, under Toktamish, Mamai's successor, gained possession of the Kremlin, and almost levelled Moscow to the ground.

After the death of Cyprian, the Metropolitan see was vacant three years, when Photius was elected (1410—

1432), under whom a lamentable schism occurred in the Russian Church. Jagiello, King of Poland, had, in 1392, ceded Lithuania, together with Kief, which it appears had come into the possession of Poland, to his cousin Vitovt, with the title of Grand Prince. Both Jagiello and Vitovt were members of the Roman Church, but, as Cyprian was much respected by both, no rupture occurred so long as he was Patriarch. Photius appears to have been wanting in tact; and possessed with the customary hatred of the Greeks to the Latins, refused to visit Kief, although it was under his jurisdiction. Thereupon Vitovt, after a synod which he intimidated into his views, requested the Patriarch Joseph to consecrate Gregory Zemblak as Metropolitan of Kief, so that the Orthodox in his Principality might no longer be under the jurisdiction of Moscow. When the Patriarch rejected his petition, as a violation of the unity of the Russian Church, Vitovt called another Synod of bishops, whom he compelled to consecrate Gregory. Gregory long stood out against this arrangement, and endeavoured to lead Vitovt to Orthodoxy; but he eventually yielded, as the point involved discipline rather than doctrine. But thenceforward the Orthodox Church of Russia had two Metropolitans, both subject to the Patriarch of Constantinople, one at Moscow, the other usually residing at Vilna, the capital of Lithuania.

Dmitri Donskoi was succeeded by his son, Basil III. (1389—1425), after whom followed his grandson, Basil IV. (1425—1462). After the death of Photius the Metropolitan see was vacant seven years; the Grand Prince then summoned a synod which elected Jonah, Bishop of Riazan, who was sent to Constantinople for consecration. But he found that Isidore, a bishop of Illyria,

had been already consecrated by the Patriarch Joseph; and Isidore remained Metropolitan. On January 8, 1438, Pope Eugenius IV. opened the council of Ferrara, for the union of the Greek and Latin Churches. Isidore, who was a friend of the Pope and in favour of the Union, represented to the Grand Prince that it was proper that the Russian Church should be represented at the council. Basil reluctantly consented, and bade the Bishop of Suzdal to accompany Isidore to the council. "Our fathers and ancestors," he said, "never asked for a union with the Latin Church. We do not commission you to go and take part in a council in a Latin country; but if you will not listen to me and are determined to go, bear in mind the purity of our faith and guard it faithfully." Mention has been made in a previous chapter of the councils of Ferrara and Florence[a]. Isidore was one of the signatories of the Union of Florence.

Dignified with the title of Cardinal Legate of the Apostolic See, Isidore returned, as he thought in triumph, to Moscow, the bearer of a letter from the Pope announcing the happy termination of the council. But the Russian was as much opposed to the council as the other branches of the Greek Church; M. Boissier[b] makes the Bishop of Suzdal a supporter of Mark of Ephesus at Florence. Isidore was received with the greatest indignation; all classes of the people rejected the supremacy of the Pope, and the addition of the Filioque to the Creed. When, at Mass in the Kremlin, Isidore mentioned the Pope's name in the place of the Patriarch, Basil openly rebuked him as a false bishop and traitor to Orthodoxy; his goods were confiscated, and he was consigned to the

[a] See p. 320. [b] II. 49.

Choudof monastery. Contriving to escape he fled to Rome, and, as we have seen [c], was sent to Constantinople to complete the short-lived union.

Isidore was the last Metropolitan instituted at Constantinople; Basil, in a letter to the Patriarch, insisted on the right of Russia, whilst it allowed the supremacy of the Patriarchs of Constantinople, to elect and institute its own Metropolitans. After the see, owing to the troubles in the East, had been vacant for more than eight years, St. Jonah (1453—1462), Bishop of Riazan, the successor of Isidore, was consecrated in a synod of Russian bishops.

In 1462, Ivan III., son of the last Basil, became Grand Prince. Twenty-two years of age at his accession he reigned more than forty-three years (1462—1505 [d]). Under him the Mongol supremacy came to an end, and he acquired the title of "the Maker of Russia."

In 1472 Ivan married Zoe, daughter of Thomas, the brother of the last two Palæologi, who, after the fall of Constantinople, had taken up his residence in Rome, where his daughter was educated in the principles of the Florentine Union. The marriage was brought about by Pope Paul II., by the advice of Cardinal Bessarion. The Pope acted partly in the hope of promoting a Crusade against the Turks, but chiefly in the expectation that the marriage of a Roman Catholic Princess, the heiress of the Palæologi, with the Grand Prince of Moscow, would effect that in which the council of Florence had so signally failed, and bring the Russian Church under

[c] p. 326.

[d] It may be mentioned that in the reign of Ivan we hear of an Archimandrite being publicly knouted. Corporal punishment of the clergy was not abolished till the reign of Catherine II.

the Pope's supremacy. It was a smart stroke of policy on the part of the Pope, but it was a deeper and more successful one on the part of Ivan. Anticipating the time when the Third Rome may inherit the succession of the Second Rome on the Bosphorus, he, immediately after his marriage, added the two-headed eagle, the symbol of the Imperial power, to the arms of Russia; thus implying that he acquired the rights of the Roman Emperors. Moscow, the Third Rome, succeeded Constantinople, as the Second Rome had succeeded Old Rome; and who can doubt that Russia was raised up in the providence of God, as the champion of Orthodoxy against the effects of 1453?

Zoe went to Russia attended by the papal legate, Antony. When the legate was about to enter Moscow, the Patriarch Philip told the Grand Prince that if the legate entered by one gate, he himself would go out by another. When the legate pressed the Florentine Union, the Metropolitan told him that the Russian faith was older and purer than the Roman; and when the Metropolitan proposed to discuss their differences, the legate, says M. Boissier[e], said he had not brought his books with him.

Russia has always insisted on its Princesses adopting the Orthodox faith, so that the change of religion in Zoe or Sophia (to call her by her baptismal name) need not be regarded as a triumph for Orthodoxy. She went to Moscow attended by a large retinue of Greek emigrants, who took with them from Constantinople a rich collection of valuable MSS., which had escaped the rapacity of the Turks; thus was formed the nucleus of the present

[e] II. 52.

Library of the Patriarchs, which did much towards restoring the learning which had so seriously suffered under the Mongols. Over Ivan Sophia exerted a paramount influence; she instigated the people to shake off the yoke of the Mongols, which she, the proud daughter of a Palæologus, viewed with less complacency than Russians, whom their long servitude had habituated to it.

In 1478, Novgorod the Great (*la pucelle*, as it might have been called), which had never been profaned by Moslem arms—an immunity which its grateful citizens ascribed, not to any earthly power but, to its special patron, St. George—fell before the arms of Ivan. Euphemius, the Archbishop of Novgorod, had, at Ivan's birth, predicted that he would be an illustrious Prince; but "woe," he said, "to Novgorod; Novgorod will fall at his feet and never rise again." The republic of Novgorod, which wavered between allegiance to the Metropolitans of Moscow and Kief, was rent asunder by anarchy; Gerontius, Metropolitan of Moscow, urged Ivan to proclaim a holy war against Lithuania, in which, in 1478, Novgorod fell. Theophilus, the Archbishop of Novgorod, who was on the Orthodox side, interceded for the citizens; their lives were spared, but thousands were banished, and their goods confiscated; and Novgorod was incorporated with Russia.

Ivan succeeded in reconciling the Princes, and in converting Russia from a congeries of small States into a united Kingdom. When, in the same year that Novgorod fell, the Mongol Khan Akmet sent his messengers to receive the usual tribute, he determined to declare war against the Horde at Sarai, and to throw off the Mongol yoke. It had been the custom, whenever the ambassadors of the Horde visited Moscow, for the Princes to fall on

their knees to receive the orders of the Khan. Ivan, urged on by his wife, now refused to comply with the degrading custom, and, it is said, put all the messengers to death except one, who was spared to convey the intelligence to the Horde. But Ivan was, apparently, better suited for a diplomatist than a warrior; his resolution faltered, and he counselled delay. Murmurs and indignation met him on all sides. Archbishop Bassian of Rostof rebuked his cowardice with stinging words; "Dost thou fear death; thou too like others must die—give me thy warriors and, old as I am, I will not turn my back upon the Tartars." Gerontius, the Metropolitan, reminded him how "the good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep." Akmet had expected help from the Roman Catholic Lithuanians, but they were kept at bay by Ivan's ally, the Khan of the Crimea. The two armies met on the banks of the river Oka. We will give the unheroic episode of Russia's liberation from the Mongol yoke, in the words of M. Rambaud[f]; "An inexplicable panic seized the two armies; Russians and Mongols fled, when no man pursued. The Khan never stopped till he reached the Horde; and Akmet was put to death by his own soldiers." The Golden Horde survived a few years longer, exposed to the attacks of the Khans of the Crimea; but in 1502 Sarai was reduced to ruins.

In the reign of Ivan a heresy arose which has ever since left its mark on the Russian Church. After the death of Gerontius, the Metropolitan see of Moscow was vacant eighteen months, when, in 1491, Zosimus, Archimandrite of the Simonof monastery, was appointed by Ivan, without the consent of the Synod. In 1470 a Judaizing sect,

[f] I. 239.

under a Jew named Zacharias, made its appearance at Novgorod, purporting to found its creed on a cabalistic writing in its possession, which it asserted God, at the creation of the world, had delivered to Adam, and from which Solomon derived his wisdom, and the Prophets their foreknowledge. The sect cast odium on the Virgin, on Saints and Icons, and taught that the Advent was yet to come. It seduced to its opinions two priests of Novgorod, Alexis and Dionysius, the former of whom changed his own name to that of Abraham, and his wife's to Sarah. They gained a large following at Novgorod and Pskof; they deceived the Archimandrite Zosimus, and for a time Ivan, who, in 1480, brought them to Moscow, and, notwithstanding the protestation of Gennadius, the Archbishop of Novgorod, and the Metropolitan Gerontius, advanced them to high positions in the Church.

In time the sect attained such power and influence, bringing to their side Zosimus, now Metropolitan, that the politic Ivan, feeling that danger to the Church involved danger to the Throne, determined to extirpate the heresy. Yielding to the earnest solicitations of his Orthodox subjects, Ivan summoned a synod to Moscow, by which the Strigolniks, as the sect was called, were condemned, the offending priests, though still screened by Zosimus, being anathematized, and committed to prison, and their goods confiscated. Zosimus was, in 1496, on a charge of intemperance, deposed by Ivan, and committed to a monastery; but the corrupt teaching had done much harm and given rise to many blasphemous opinions and practices.

Ivan then rejected the nominee of a synod of Bishops, and himself appointed as Metropolitan, Simeon, Hegumen of the Troitza monastery; thus claiming the same rights

over the Church as he had succeeded in exercising over the State.

Of the two great Slavic States, whilst Russia belonged to the Greek (as has been before remarked), Poland belonged to the Latin, Church[g]. Casimir IV. at his death left Poland to his eldest son, John Albert (1492—1501), and Lithuania to his second son, Alexander. A treaty of peace having been lately concluded between Russia and Poland, Ivan determined to cement it by the marriage of his daughter, Helena, with Alexander, the brother of the Polish King. By a treaty in October, 1494, it was arranged that Helena was to have her own Orthodox attendants, to follow her own religion, and a chapel for her Greek services was to be built at Vilna; and she received instructions from her parents never to enter a Latin Church. On these terms the marriage was celebrated in January, 1495, by a Latin bishop and a Greek priest.

At that time Alexander VI. (1492—1503) was Pope of Rome. It does not appear to have occurred to the Pope, that the opinion of a man who was scandalizing Christendom by his wickedness was worth little. He urged upon the Prince the violation of God's command; if his wife would not renounce the Greek Church, he must renounce his wife. Ivan had already had reason to complain that, contrary to the agreement, Helena had been compelled to abandon her Greek services; that her Orthodox servants had been replaced by those of the Roman Communion; that Macarius, the Orthodox Metropolitan of Kief, had been murdered, and a Latin appointed in his place. Both Ivan and Sophia were strongly opposed to

[g] See p. 264.

their daughter's renunciation of the Orthodox Church. Quarrels between Ivan and his son-in-law, followed by a war in 1500, were the consequence of the Pope's unholy interference; the Poles, notwithstanding the alliance of the Sword-bearers, were defeated and cut to pieces in the battle of Vedrocka.

In 1501 Alexander succeeded his brother as King of Poland (1501—1506). In 1503 Sophia died. In that year Helena effected a reconciliation between her husband and her father, and a truce was agreed to, on the condition, on which Ivan insisted, that his daughter's faith should not be tampered with. Pope Julius II. (1503—1513), whose military propensities scandalized Christendom, in only a less degree than the lives of his three predecessors, hurled his anathemas against the perplexed King, who, however, notwithstanding the action of two Popes, lived, till his death, in complete harmony with his wife.

Ivan died in 1505, having almost, but not entirely, eradicated the Appanages.

Ivan's eldest son having died in 1490 (the doctor who attended him being put to death), he was succeeded by his son, Basil V. (1505—1533), under whom the Appanages completely came to an end. On the death of his brother-in-law, Alexander, Basil was an unsuccessful candidate for the throne of Poland; Alexander's brother, Sigismond, being elected, whose reign (1506—1548) nearly coincides with that of Henry VIII. of England, and covers the most important part of the Reformation.

After having been for twenty years married to his wife, Salome, and having no cause of complaint except that she had borne him no heir to the throne, Basil obtained a dispensation, to which the Greek Patriarchs refused their consent, from the time-serving Metropolitan Daniel

(1522—1539), enabling him to take another wife. Salome, protesting against her cruel treatment, was forced to take the veil, and, two months afterwards, Basil married a noble Lithuanian, Helena Glinsky. Mark, Patriarch of Jerusalem, is said to have foretold the evil consequence of the marriage, and Russia paid dearly for the weak compliance of its Metropolitan, for the fruit of the marriage was Ivan the Terrible.

In the reign of Basil it was found necessary to make a review of the Russian Service-Books, into which the copyists had introduced many strange interpellations and novelties; so glaring were the errors that the Metropolitan Barlaam (1511—1522), impressed on Basil the necessity of a revision. Basil accordingly, in 1518, requested Theoleptus, Patriarch of Constantinople, to send to Moscow some learned scholar, to arrange the valuable collection of MSS. brought into Russia by his mother, Sophia, and to arrange the Service-Books. Maximus, a monk of Mount Athos, a learned Greek scholar, but who himself admitted his inadequate knowledge of the Slavic language, was accordingly selected. After the Fall of Constantinople many learned Greeks, carrying with them valuable MSS., sought an asylum in Italy, and Florence became the cradle of the New Learning. Amongst these was Maximus, who took Savonarola as his teacher and example, and after Savonarola's tragical end, sought a refuge from the world in the monastery of the Annunciation on Mount Athos.

Maximus averred that never in Greece nor Italy had he seen such a vast collection of MSS. as he found in the Kremlin. He took up his residence in the Choudof monastery, with the task assigned him of revising more than twenty folio volumes in the Palace Library; trans-

lating and commenting on the Psalter, and correcting the Liturgical books ; a work which engaged him nine years.

Barlaam having resigned the Metropolitan see to retire to the Simonof, his former monastery, Daniel, an old-fashioned, ignorant Hegumen, who was jealous of the learning and ability of Maximus, was appointed, and to the ignorance of the Metropolitan and the clergy Maximus owed his fall. He was accused, especially by the Strigolniks, of being a heretic, and falsifying the doctrine of the Church. The errors in the Service-Books were held in reverence, on the ground of their supposed antiquity ; and the more unintelligible they were, the greater was their sanctity, as containing mysteries supposed to be derived from the Fathers.

Having completed the task assigned him, Maximus asked permission to return to Mount Athos. But, by denouncing his second marriage, he had made an enemy of the Grand Prince, who delivered him to his enemies ; and having been condemned in a Synod for heresy, and a wrong translation of the Books, he was, in 1527, committed to a monastery at Tver, from which he was delivered by Ivan IV., to end his days in the Troitza monastery.

Four years after his marriage with Helena Glinsky, Basil, having received the tonsure of a monk, died, leaving a consolidated Empire to his son, Ivan IV., a boy three years of age.

The young Prince was left under the guidance of his mother, a woman of indifferent character and unfitted for the regency ; the country was consequently plunged into anarchy, the evils of which were increased by the licentiousness of the Court. After her sudden death in 1538, the Boyars, who, under Ivan III., had risen to great

influence, and now succeeded to the unruliness of the Princes, took upon themselves the guardianship of the Throne. The Kingdom was rent asunder by their turbulence and disorder; the Metropolitan Daniel, as well as his successor Joasaph (1539—1542), were, without conviction or trial, deposed, and ended their lives in monasteries.

Left to the guidance of such unprincipled guardians, the young Prince, together with his feeble-minded brother Yury, was subjected to great privation and hardship; "treated like children of beggars," as he afterwards wrote, "ill-clothed and hungry." The Boyars intrigued to get the supreme power themselves; the Grand Prince was deliberately reared in ignorance, his education neglected, his faults connived at, and all that was bad in his nature cultivated, in the hope that when he attained his majority, he might be found incapable of assuming the government.

A better councillor than the Metropolitan Macarius (1542—1564) could not have been found; by his advice, it may be mentioned, Ivan imported the printing-press, the printing-press of Metaxa[h], into Moscow. But the tares had been sown in a soil naturally harsh and cruel, and delighting in fiendish amusements; so that, notwithstanding the endeavours of the Primate to remove them, they grew with his growth, and ripened into the harvest of unparalleled horrors, which have handed him down to prosterity as Ivan the Terrible.

His character is a problem difficult of explanation. His inhuman love of bloodshed for its own sake; his delight in torturing animals; his letting loose wild

[h] See p. 341.

bears on innocent and unsuspecting people, as they passed under his windows; such traits in his character might lead people to dispose of him as a madman. But in his madness there was method. Acts of religion, combined with cruelty and murder; extreme reverence for the external forms of the Church; rising at three in the morning to ring the bells for Matins; praying with such fervour that marks of his prostration were to be observed on his forehead; then rushing off to the dungeons to gloat over the agonies of tortured prisoners; claiming for himself reverence scarcely second to that of God; sinning and repenting, and then falling into worse sins than ever, till he became a master of vice and sacrilege; such horrors might be passed over, except that unhappily he extended them to the Church. Like blood-thirsty men in general, he was deficient in courage; yet his campaigns took the character of Crusades, religious ceremonies being observed amidst military exercises, and prayers preceding and following every movement.

At his coronation in January, 1547, when he was eighteen years of age, he was the first of the Grand Princes to assume the title of Tsar; this was confirmed, in 1561, by an act of the Patriarch Joasaph, signed by thirty-six Metropolitans and bishops, who subscribed a letter, conveying the Patriarchal blessing to "the last scion of the ancient Imperial house;" the Second Rome thus recognizing the heir of Moscow, the third Rome.

Shortly after his coronation he married a Russian lady, the virtuous Anastasia Romanof, to whom the present dynasty of Russia owes its descent. In the same year occurred a fire, which consumed a large part of Moscow, and in which 1,700 people perished. This, and the influence of his wife, brought conviction to his mind; and

the good resolutions which he formed were strengthened by Silvester, a holy priest of Novgorod, by whom he was guided till 1560, when he sent him into banishment.

The want of theological colleges, the ignorance of the clergy, and the consequent growth of dissenting opinions both in the people and in the clergy, and the incorrect transcriptions of the liturgical Books, induced Ivan, acting by the advice of Macarius, to convene, in 1551, at Moscow, "the Hundred Chapters Synod;" so called from one result of the Synod, the publication of "the Book of the Hundred Chapters," it being divided into one hundred paragraphs, which prescribed rules as to the external and internal discipline of the Church, the morals of the clergy, and the correction of the Books. One good result of the synod was the establishment of National Schools, in which the children were to be taught reading and writing, and choral singing. Otherwise the synod increased, rather than diminished, ecclesiastical difficulties, by giving synodical sanction to opinions more favourable to the Raskol[1], which were spread abroad by the recent introduction of printing, than to Orthodoxy, and which produced a lasting schism in the Russian Church. But, says Mouravief, its acts were never confirmed by the Russian bishops; Macarius makes no mention of the synod in his works; and, it being the dark age of the Russian Church, the clergy were so ignorant that no correction of the Books was possible.

The good results in the Tsar's character were shown in the prosperity of Church and State, in Russia. In 1552 the Khanate of Kazan was subdued; its Khan, Edigher, and his family received Baptism, and a Metro-

[1] The name by which dissent is known in Russia.

politan see was established at Kazan. In 1554 Astrachan, where a new Khanate had risen on the fall of Akmet, was conquered, and the Hegumen Cyril was commissioned to build a monastery and two churches, to be placed under the Metropolitan of Kazan. In 1557 the Prince of the Caucasus sent to Moscow to ask that missionary priests might be sent to his country. Everything prospered with Ivan; the birth of his son Dmitri, and after his early death, the birth of two other sons, Ivan and Feodor, secured in his family the succession to the Throne.

Nor was Ivan unmindful of the source from which the prosperity of the Church and Nation was derived. When on his triumphal entry into Moscow after the victory at Kazan, the Metropolitan Macarius and the clergy went out to meet him, Ivan humbly prostrated himself, and in his speech attributed his victory to the prayers of the prelate; and, as a lasting memorial of his gratitude to God, he built the most magnificent of the churches of Moscow, which was consecrated under the name of "The Protection of the Holy Virgin." If Ivan had then died, at the age of thirty, his name would have been handed down as that of a model Sovereign.

Compare this with the later years of his life; Russia conquered by the Poles under Stephen Batory; the Russians expelled from Livonia; Polotsk lost; all Moscow, except the Kremlin, reduced to ashes by the Khan of the Crimea.

Anastasia died in 1560, Macarius in 1564. By their deaths, and after his subsequent marriage with the Circassian Princess, Mary, he was left to his own guidance, and his evil genius re-asserted itself.

After Macarius, Athanasius was Metropolitan only one

year. Ivan, pretending that his work for the good of his people was impeded by the Metropolitan, and that it was impossible to carry on the work in Moscow; having first ordered Athanasius to celebrate Mass in the Cathedral of the Assumption, where he prayed with the utmost devotion, and received the blessing of the Metropolitan, left the city, and took up his residence in the neighbouring fortress of Alexandrof. But the people clamoured for his return; they declared that the Tsar was given them by God Himself, and compared his throne to the Throne of Heaven; they complained that they were exposed to their enemies; and that, without a Tsar, they were like sheep without a shepherd. A deputation of prelates was appointed to seek him out; and, prostrating themselves before him, they implored him to return. After a show of resistance Ivan consented; but on condition that there should be no interference between him and his victims.

Soon after his return the horrors of his reign commenced. The gentle and timid Metropolitan abdicated, and returned to his former monastery. Herman, Archbishop of Kazan, was next appointed, but when he ventured to remonstrate, he was sent back to his former diocese.

A holier prelate than St. Philip the Church does not number amongst its Saints and Martyrs. Richly endowed by nature with gifts both bodily and mental; the bearer of a noble name, and heir to a large estate, Feodor Kolichef forsook all, and in 1539 entered, as a pilgrim, the Solovetsky monastery in the Frozen Sea, where he took the vows of a monk, under the name of Philip; and after nine years was elected Hegumen.

Ivan summoned him to his presence, on the ground of needing his spiritual guidance. What fleeting fit of con-

science induced Ivan to hunt up for Metropolitan one of Philip's noted sanctity, it is difficult to imagine. With bitter tears the saintly Hegumen, foreseeing too surely the fate that awaited him, quitted his peaceful retirement; and Ivan, deaf to his entreaties, forced him, in 1565, to accept the Metropolitan see.

In 1568 Ivan instituted as his body-guard a select legion called Opreechniks, consisting, professedly, of men of noble birth, but really of 6,000 villainous youths of the lowest class, whose duty it was to act as spies and informers, and to massacre all persons opposed to the Tsar. From the bloodthirsty acts which they committed, they were called by the people Kromieskniks, which may perhaps be rendered in English, *Black-Guards.*

The palace which he built at Alexandrof, and which, in preference to Moscow he still made his residence, he, himself well versed in the Scriptures, converted into a monastery, with cells and a magnificent chapel. There he and his mock-monks donned gorgeous vestments, mimicked the services of the Orthodox Church, and rivalled monastic austerities, inflicting on themselves severe tortures; Ivan himself, as a salve to his conscience, underwent rigid penance, and wrote to other monasteries rebuking them with the neglect of their Rule, remonstrating with them for their slothfulness, and the laxity of their discipline.

The Metropolitan Philip, unsupported by the timid and time-serving bishops, was soon brought face to face with Ivan and his Opreechniks. Ivan had now added to his other offences that of marrying a fourth wife. Dressed in the garb of their Order, and accompanied by a body of his "Peculiars," Ivan entered on a Sunday the Church of the Assumption, and sought in vain the blessing of the Metropolitan. This was the first scene in the fatal drama;

Philip remonstrated, and the remonstrance cost him his life. The Tsar, beside himself with rage, was with difficulty restrained from laying violent hands on him; but he soon threw off all restraint. Two unworthy prelates, those of Suzdal and Riazan, the creatures of Ivan, found a witness, who invented a false accusation. In vain he, whose holy life belied the charge, asked leave to return to his peaceful monastery. The Tsar's wrath was not thus to be appeased; the censure was public, the vengeance must be public also. Ivan obtained his condemnation by a spiritual Court. In the midst of the Liturgy, whilst Philip was celebrating at the Holy Table, the Opreechniks rushed into the Church, tore the robes off his back, and dragged him, almost naked, to prison; the only words he used were "Pray to God;" the next day the sentence of deposition was pronounced against him. He was first confined in the monastery of St. Nicolas, and eight days afterwards conveyed under a strong guard to Tver. Thither, in December, 1569, the fanatic Tsar sent his Minister Skuratof to ask his blessing; Philip well knew what that meant, and he was smothered in his cell, "suffering for the faith like a second John the Baptist[k]."

Cyril III., formerly Hegumen of the Novinsky monastery, the successor of Philip, and Antony, Archbishop of Polotsk, the next Metropolitans of Moscow, passed as insignificant prelates, mere tools of the Tsar, and left no mark on the Russian Church.

At the end of 1569 a terrible massacre occurred at Novgorod. Ivan, being then at war with Sigismond II., King of Poland, accused the people of Novgorod of a

[k] Mouravief, p. 118.

project, which only existed in the imagination of his Ministers, for admitting the enemy into the city. Ivan, having first attended service in the Cathedral of Novgorod, afterwards partook of a banquet in the Refectory of Pimen. Pimen, the Archbishop, was one of the spiritual Court which condemned St. Philip. At a given signal the Opreechniks rushed in, seized and threw Pimen into prison, and a general massacre, lasting over five weeks, of the innocent citizens followed; the monasteries were ransacked; more than 500 clergy perished, and 60,000 corpses lay, at one and the same time, unburied, in the streets of Moscow. The massacre was followed by famine and pestilence, which carried off most of the survivors, and from the effect of its desolation the ancient capital of Ruric never recovered.

Ivan next went to Pskof, intending to subject the people to an indiscriminate massacre. The trembling inhabitants, having spent the night in prayer, went forth to meet him, throwing themselves at his feet, imploring mercy, and offering him the usual compliments of bread and salt. A mad hermit made him a more appropriate offering, a piece of raw meat. "I am a Christian," said Ivan, "and do not eat meat during the Great Lent." "Thou doest worse," was the reply, "thou eatest man's flesh, forgetting not only Lent but God Himself;" and he threatened him with the vengeance of Heaven, if he or his Opreechniks touched a child's hair in the city. Just then the church-bells summoning the people to Matins were heard; Pskof was saved; Ivan, as superstitious as he was brutal, hastened away to Moscow, to find his capital burnt by the Khan of the Crimea, and the Poles and Swedes ravaging the country.

Of this inhuman tyrant, Pope Gregory XIII. (1572—

1585) could praise, six years after the murder of St. Philip, "the piety and amiable qualities[1]." Six years later, when Stephen Batory was at war with Russia, and carrying all before him, Ivan implored the mediation of the Pope. Gregory sent him a Crucifix, a Rosary studded with diamonds, and a richly bound book of the council of Florence; and promised his good offices with Batory, but on the condition of Ivan accepting the Union. The Pope's agent was more successful in the political than the religious side of his mission; he succeeded in obtaining favourable terms from Batory; but when Possevin came to the Union of Florence the wily Jesuit met his match in Ivan;—"We have never had anything to do with the Roman Confession, nor do we desire it now." But the mission of Possevin, if a failure in Moscow, left its traces in Lithuania, and paved the way for the introduction of the Unia, of which mention will be made in the next chapter.

In 1581 Ivan attained the climax of his crimes by the murder, when in an ungovernable fit of frenzy, of his eldest and favourite son, Ivan. In the number of his seven wives he out-did Henry the Eighth of England; most of them were short-lived and died natural deaths; one he consigned to a monastery, but we do not read of any wife suffering a violent death.

The cruel murder of his son brought despair to his conscience. Ivan's remaining days, haunted by the shades of the many human beings whom he had murdered, were embittered by remorse. He ordered prayers in the churches for the souls of his victims; and sent rich gifts for the good of his own soul to the monasteries of Mount

[1] Karamsin, IX. 49.

Sinai and Athos, and to the Holy Sepulchre. In March, 1584, the fiftieth year of his life, being seized by a fatal illness, he received the tonsure from the Metropolitan Dionysius, and Ivan the Terrible died the monk Jonah; and his coffin is to-day to be seen in a chapel in St. Michael's at Archangel, which the cruel monster himself founded.

CHAPTER III.

The Russian Church under Patriarchs.

Ivan IV. left two sons, Feodor by his first wife, Anastasia, and Dmitri by his seventh wife. Feodor I., who succeeded as Tsar (1584—1598), inherited the gentle traits of his mother's character, and was more fitted for the life of a recluse than of an Emperor; so that during his reign the real power was in the hands of the Boyars, chief amongst whom were Nikita Romanof, the brother of the Tsar's mother, and Boris Godunof, the unscrupulous brother of his wife Irene.

Between the Tsar Feodor and the aspirations of Boris Godunof to the throne, Dmitri, an important name in the coming annals of Russia, was, after the death of Nikita, the sole impediment. Dmitri was sent for his education to Ouglich, where, at the age of eight years, he met with a mysterious death.

In the reign of Feodor I. the Metropolitan see of Russia was raised into a Patriarchate. That such a change could be brought about without schism, controversy, or disturbance, is, says the late Professor Freeman, a strong commentary on the history of the Greek Church.

The Russian clergy complained, with reason, that, since the fall of Constantinople, they were subject to a Patriarch who was under the dominion of the infidels. It was found that, whilst the Patriarch of Constantinople was hampered in his action through the oppression of the Sultan, one, and that a comparatively small, diocese of Russia had under its jurisdiction a larger population than

the three Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem taken together.

In 1586, Joachim, Patriarch of Antioch, arrived in Moscow in quest of alms. Boris Godunof, who contrived to get the clergy on his side, impressed upon the Emperor that the visit of the Patriarch afforded a favourable opportunity for raising the see of Moscow into a Partriarchate.

Dionysius, styled from his learning *Grammaticus*, not favouring the ambitious scheme of Boris, was deposed, the compliant clergy raising no voice against the proceeding ; and Job, a man of more compliant temper, was appointed Metropolitan. The matter of the Patriarchate was brought before Joachim, who promised to consult his brother Patriarchs and the sacred Synod of the Eastern Church ; and in the following year, a Greek refugee brought to Moscow intelligence that the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch had invited the two other Patriarchs to Constantinople, to discuss the matter.

We must for a moment advert to the chronic state of persecution which the Eastern Church suffered from the Turks.

Jeremias II., the successor of Metrophanes III., after having been twice deposed, had recovered the Patriarchal throne. But, A.D. 1584, Theoleptus, sister's son to Metrophanes, bribed Sultan Murad III., with 2,000 pieces of gold over and above the usual price, to make him Patriarch ; Jeremias was confined in prison at Rhodes for three years, and Theoleptus for that time held the Patriarchate. It can scarcely be believed (but unfortunately it is history), that the Christian nations of Europe would tolerate such a see-saw state of persecution inflicted on their fellow-Christians ; but when Theoleptus' turn for deposi-

tion came, Jeremias, after the Sultan had plundered the property of the Church, destroyed the cells of the *religious*, and converted the Patriarchal Church into a Mosque, was (for the third time) re-instated, on condition of his building a Patriarchal Church and cells for the *religious* in another part of Constantinople.

Everything in the Patriarchal treasury having been plundered by the Turks, the Œcumenical Patriarch, having no other means of meeting the Sultan's order, determined, with the consent of his synod and the sanction of the Sultan, to visit Christian countries. In July, 1588, he arrived at Smolensk, whence he, as "by the Grace of God Archbishop of Constantinople, which is New Rome, and Patriarch of the whole Universe," wrote to the Tsar asking permission to visit Moscow, which, he said, he had long been desirous of doing, but owing to the troubles and persecutions of his country, and himself having been thrice imprisoned, he had been prevented.

The permission having been accorded, the Patriarch, seated upon an ass, made his entry into the Kremlin, where he was received with high honour by the Tsar, seated on his throne, and attended by the Boyars and great Lords of his Court. The Patriarch, having first done reverence to the Icon of Our Lady, gave his blessing to the monarch, and presented him with a golden Panagia, containing pieces of the true Cross, of the Robes of Our Saviour and of the Mother of God, as well as with the Spear, the Reed, the Sponge, the Crown of Thorns, emblems of our Saviour's Passion.

With regard to the proposed Patriarchate, the Tsar had scruples in his mind as to the rights of the Metropolitan Job; and Jeremias, having been detained several weeks

without anything being settled, announced his desire of returning to Constantinople. Thereupon the Tsar acquainted him, through Boris Godunof, with his desire for a Russian Patriarchate ; and proposed that, as Jeremias had informed him of the persecutions to which he was subjected, he should be Patriarch of the ancient throne of Vladimir, whilst Job should continue Metropolitan of Moscow ; for that it would be unjust to remove Job, and inexpedient to replace him by a Greek, with whom, as his Director in spiritual matters, the Tsar could only communicate through an interpreter.

The Patriarch could not recognize the possibility of living so far as Vladimir was from the Patriarchal see; but he expressed his willingness to consecrate and confirm, "by divine inspiration," whomsoever Feodor should elect. The number of five Patriarchates, as defined by the General Councils, was held by Jeremias to be inviolable. But it was contended that Old Rome had in the eleventh century apostatized from the Catholic Church, and that a Patriarchate of the Third Rome was required to fill the vacancy.

A synod of Russian bishops, assembled at Moscow on January 19, 1589, submitted three names to Feodor, who selected Job ; and on January 23, in the Church of the Most Immaculate Mother of God, Jeremias, assisted by the assembled bishops, consecrated Job "as the equal of the ancient Patriarchs;" repeating the whole office for the consecration of a Bishop; "it being rightly thought," says Mouravief, "that a double portion of grace was necessary to fulfil the duty of his high calling."

On January 30, Job, with the blessing of the Œcumenical Patriarch, raised Alexander and Barlaam, the

Archbishops respectively of Novgorod and Rostof, the two Archbishops who had been nominated with him, to the office of Metropolitans. The Russian Church now had a Patriarch (not of Vladimir, but of Moscow), and four Metropolitans, viz., of Novgorod, Rostof, Kazan, and the united sees of Astrachan and Krutich. A charter was drawn up to the effect that Old Rome had fallen away through the Apollinarian heresy (probably a vague allusion to the *Filioque*); that Moscow was the Third Rome; and that the order of precedence was Constantinople, Alexandria, Moscow, Antioch, and Jerusalem.

If the marriage of Ivan III. with the heiress of the Greek Emperors was of civil importance, as fore-shadowing the time when Russia would take the place of the Byzantine Emperors; the institution of the Patriarchate of Moscow was of ecclesiastical importance, as foreshadowing the time when the Russian Church, thus placed on an equality with the other Patriarchates, would be the acknowledged head of the Orthodox Greek Church.

In May the Œcumenical Patriarch left Russia, promising to send letters confirming the Russian Patriarchate, from a synod to be assembled at Constantinople. He had only proceeded as far as Smolensk when he was overtaken by messengers, conveying from the Tsar a present of 1,000 roubles towards the new Patriarchal Church, as well as a letter to Murad, "his brother and good friend," asking that he would afford the same protection that former Sultans had given to the Patriarchs, to the Patriarch Jeremias.

Two years after the departure of Jeremias, Dionysius, Motropolitan of Bulgaria, brought to Moscow a synodal document, signed by Jeremias, Joachim of Antioch, and

Sophronius of Jerusalem (the Patriarchate of Alexandria being vacant through the death of Silvester, the predecessor of Meletius Pega[a]), as well as by forty-two Eastern Metropolitans, nineteen Archbishops, and twenty Bishops. The Patriarch of Moscow was confirmed in the place of the bishop of Rome, who had fallen away; and assigned the fifth place, after Jerusalem. Feodor was willing to concede the second place to the Patriarch of Alexandria, as the Œcumenical Judge; but both he and Job wrote to the Eastern Patriarchs in support of their claim to the third place; they eventually gave way, and Moscow accepted the fifth place. In fact nothing but an Œcumenical Council (which in the present divided state of Christendom was impracticable), could alter the order as arranged by an Œcumenical Council.

Notwithstanding this disappointment, the Tsar dismissed Dionysius with bountiful alms towards the new Patriarchal Church.

Soon after the Patriarchate of Moscow was established, danger on the side of Lithuania and Poland, through the election of Sigismond III. to the Crown of Poland, threatened the Russian Church. The Reformation exerted a strong influence on Poland, which, like other nations of the North, broke away from the Church of Rome. Before the Reformation a reforming spirit had manifested itself in the country. Wicliffe's opinions were caught up by John Huss, and by him circulated in Bohemia, between which country and Poland a common origin and a common language existed. The Polish Nobles at the Council of Constance indignantly protested against the violation of the *safe conduct* granted to Huss by the German Em-

[a] See p. 337.

peror Sigismond; and after Huss' murder his doctrines were eagerly embraced in Poland.

Sigismond I. (*the Great*), under whom Poland reached its greatest height (although Eck dedicated to him his Treatise against Luther), stood for the most part aloof from the religious differences which distracted Western Christendom; he allowed his subjects perfect freedom in religion, whenever it did not interfere with public order; and under him the Reformation gained ground in Poland.

He was succeeded by his son, Sigismond II. (*Augustus*, 1548—1572), whose first wife Elizabeth was a Catholic from Austria; but the family of his second wife, Barbara, was strongly Protestant, in favour of the Reformation. He was a man of irresolute character; whilst he enjoined the bishops to put down heresy, he corresponded with Melancthon and Calvin, and allowed Luther to dedicate to him his Bible. So far from Poland taking part in the Council of Trent, Sigismond demanded from Pope Paul IV. (1555—1559) that the vernacular should be the language of the Services, that Communion should be in both Kinds, and the clergy be allowed to marry.

In the reign of Sigismond the first Protestant Bible in the Polish language was published, A.D. 1563; and the Reformation which the Poles adopted was not the Catholic Reformation of England, but that of Luther and Calvin. It may be mentioned, in passing, that in 1570 Sigismond sent a Moravian missionary to Ivan the Terrible, in the hope of converting him; but Ivan's Orthodoxy was as proof against Protestantism as it was against the Jesuit Possevin.

Just when Lutheran and Calvinistic Protestantism had assumed a definite form, and gained a recognized position

in Poland, and the Roman Church was on the verge of ruin, the Jesuits, soon after their institution, were introduced into the country by Stanislaus Hosen, a native of Cracow, whom Pope Pius IV. (1560—1565) appointed Cardinal-bishop of Ermeland. He obtained from Lainitz, the successor of Ignatius Loyola in the Generalship of the Order, Jesuit recruits for the recovery of Poland to the Roman Church. The foreign Reformation had no more violent opponent than Hosen; he wrote to Cardinal Guise congratulating him on the murder of Coligny; he thanked God for the massacre on St. Bartholomew's Day; and prayed Him to show equal mercy on Poland ("ut misericordiæ suæ oculis respiciat [b]"). Under the two Sigismonds the population of Poland almost doubled. Sigismond II., who died without issue, was the last of the male dynasty of Jagiello; after his death the Polish throne became elective. Ivan the Terrible was a candidate for it; but the Boyars made it to be understood that, if elected, though he would respect the Pope, he would not allow his interference in the affairs of the Orthodox Church. Notwithstanding the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day (1572), Henry of Valois (1574—1575), on his disclaiming all participation in it, was elected; terms being exacted from the French ambassador, favourable not only to the religious liberty of Poland, but also to that of France Henry soon became a tool in the hands of the Roman priests; and, on that account, added to the disgust caused by his profligacy, Poland was on the verge of civil war, when, on the death of his brother, Charles IX., he was called from Poland to assume the Crown of France.

Stephen Batory, Voivode of Transilvania, and a Pro-

[b] Krasinski's Poland, I. 42.

testant, was then elected (1576—1586). In order to obtain in marriage the hand of the Princess Anna, the last of the line of Jagiello, Batory was induced by the Jesuits to join the Roman Church. He and his wife, though generally tolerant and averse to persecution, were munificent benefactors of the Jesuits, who, during their reign, swarmed into Poland; Batory introduced Romanism into Lutheran Livonia, and established a Jesuit college at Riga.

At the head of the Jesuits were Possevin, whom we have seen brought face to face with Ivan the Terrible, and Peter Skarga, whom Batory made his chaplain. The one thought of these leaders was to bring the Orthodox Church of Russia into subjection to the Pope. Schools, colleges, and a convent (over which Skarga was placed), were built by them; and the Jesuits took deep root, not only in Poland and Lithuania, but amongst the aristocracy in the adjacent parts of Russia.

On the death, to the great loss of Poland, of Batory, three candidates for the throne presented themselves, Maximilian of Austria, Sigismond, and, by the advice of Boris Godunof, who wished to unite the two great Slavic States, the Tsar Feodor, who, however, announced his unwillingness to be crowned by a Latin prelate. The Sultan threatened war if the choice of the electors should fall on Maximilian or Feodor, the enemies of Turkey; and Sigismond was elected.

Sigismond III., King of Poland (1587—1631), was son of John III., King of Sweden, and Catharine Jagiello, sister of Sigismond Augustus, the former a Lutheran, the latter a bigoted Romanist.

Soon after Luther's rupture with Rome, the Reforma-

tion was introduced into Sweden by one of Luther's disciples, in the reign of Gustavus Vasa, who himself adopted the Lutheran faith. His son and successor, John III. (1568—1592), although he himself professed Lutheranism, allowed his son Sigismond to be educated by the Jesuits in the strictest ways of Romanism; with the result that Sigismond grew up a bigoted partizan, living to receive the title, in which he gloried, of King of the Jesuits.

On the death of John, the Swedes reluctantly accepted as their King his son Sigismond, who had for five years been King of Poland, on his pledging himself to allow them religious liberty. His violation of this pledge cost him his throne.

In 1593 the Swedish deputies assembled at Upsala, under Charles, son of Gustavus Vasa, together with the clergy and ministers of State, signed a resolution that the Augsburg Confession should alone be acknowledged in Sweden; and when Sigismond revoked the resolution, and brought against them an army from Poland, they defeated him in battle, and deposed him, and set on the throne his uncle, Charles IX., father of the great Augustus Vasa (1611—1632).

In Sigismond the Jesuits found a zealous patron, through whom they hoped for greater success in promoting the Florentine Union, than they had hitherto found, in Russia. By the Treaty of Lublin, in 1569, a closer connection between Poland and Lithuania, with a common Parliament and a single capital at Warsaw, was effected, the interests of Orthodoxy, the faith of Lithuania, being safeguarded. Though bound at his coronation by that treaty, Sigismond used all the seductions of his throne to draw the Orthodox nobility of Lithuania and the neighbouring

country to the Church of Rome, and little by little the nobles yielded to the influence of the Court. In distributing the various offices he had at his command, he invariably (unless forced by circumstances) conferred them on Romanists, and proselytes whom he had made from interest rather than conviction. Thus a breach was effected between the aristocracy and the masses, the latter remaining firmly attached to the Orthodox Church.

Nor was this favouritism confined to civil offices. The Orthodox Clergy were subjected to incessant persecution, and both public and private influence was brought to bear, in order to induce them to abandon the Greek and join the Roman Church. The Orthodox prelates were thus placed in a difficult position ; as defenders of Orthodoxy, they brought upon themselves the enmity of the Government ; whilst by the Orthodox masses, because they were unable to defend their flocks and render the assistance which they needed, they were accused of lukewarmness. Hence arose a relaxation of discipline, and even of morals, amongst the clergy.

These preliminary remarks are necessary for a clear understanding of the schism known as the Unia, which, contemptible as it will appear to any one who reflects that the Uniats, when left to themselves, returned in their millions to the Orthodox Church, needs a few words to explain its origin.

Onesiphorus, Metropolitan of Kief, which was then in Lithuanian territory, was a weak prelate ; and moreover, though otherwise a man of irreproachable life, had, contrary to the canons, been twice married.

The Patriarch Jeremias, on his homeward journey from Moscow, held a visitation at Kief, and, on the ground of this irregularity, deposed Onesiphorus ; and, being

ignorant of the Latin spirit which was gaining ground he, on the recommendation of the Lithuanian nobles, appointed Michael Ragoza, and charged the new Metropolitan to convoke a synod for the reform of the Church. Ragoza was an honest, but weak, and, in the hands of Skarga and the Jesuits, a vacillating, prelate.

One of several irregularly consecrated bishops was Cyril Terlecky, of Luck in Volhynia, who had not only been twice married, but was also a man of notoriously profligate life; but, deceived by his hypocritical pretensions, the Patriarch had continued him in his see. Dreading a reforming synod at which his hypocrisy and profligacy would be brought to light, he prevailed upon Ragoza not to summon one; having been imprisoned by the Governour of Luck, he attributed it to his Orthodoxy; and, seeing no other means of preserving his episcopal revenues, he conceived the idea of a union with Rome, on the terms of acknowledging the Pope's supremacy, whilst he retained the doctrines and discipline of the Orthodox Greek Church.

The Patriarch Jeremias, finding on a second visit that Ragoza had not called the synod; finding also that Terlecky's misdemeanours were too flagrant to be passed over; Ragoza having failed, he committed by his letters the summoning of the synod to Meletius, bishop of Vladimir in Volhynia, the neighbouring see. But the crafty Terlecky, being as averse as before, and for the same reason, to a synod, made a friendly visit to Meletius, and abstracted the Patriarchal letters; and when Meletius died shortly afterwards, he persuaded Ragoza to consecrate to the see of Vladimir Ignatius Potsi, a man of no better character than himself, who, he was aware, held the same views as himself with regard to the Church

of Rome. Terlecky and Potsi were the two chief authors of the Unia, in which they were soon joined by Ragoza.

In 1595 the two Volhynian bishops, furnished with letters from King Sigismond, applied, professedly in the name of the whole Russian Church, to Pope Clement VIII. (1592—1605), offering submission and obedience to the Pope on their own terms; viz. that they would acknowledge his supremacy, but retain the doctrine and ritual of the Orthodox Greek Church; together with the marriage of the clergy and services in Slavic. Union on these terms was eagerly caught at by Clement, and was confirmed by a synod, authorized by Sigismond, of dissidents, at Brest in Lithuania, A.D. 1596.

"The Unia was received," says the Russian historian Ustrialof, "with the universal murmurs of the Russian people, as a criminal act." Amongst its principal opponents were Gideon Balaban, bishop of Lemberg, and Constantine, Prince of Ostrog in Volhynia, and Palatine of Kief, a man venerable with his hundred years of age. To Constantine the Russian Church was already indebted for the establishment of several schools in Ostrog and Kief, and for the first complete Slavic Bible, printed on the press [c] which, after the death of Macarius, was transferred from Moscow to Ostrog. The Orthodox, like the Uniats, also held a synod, but a much more numerously attended one, at Brest, to which were sent two Exarchs from the Patriarch of Constantinople, Nicephorus, Archimandrite of the Pechersky monastery, and Cyril Lucar, the future Patriarch of Alexandria and Constantinople [d].

The Synod, at which the venerable Constantine was

[c] See p. 391.

[d] See p. 337.

present, passed an anathema on the apostates from the Orthodox Church; the Uniats retaliating with an anathema from their synod. Tumults ensued; Nicephorus was strangled, and Cyril Lucar barely escaped with his life. But, says M. Rambaud, "the attempt in favour of Rome failed piteously, the people everywhere declaring against it." Potsi was assassinated by the citizens at Vilna; Jehoshaphat, the Uniat bishop of Polotsk, met the same fate at Vitepsk, his body being thrown into the river. The renegade Metropolitan Ragoza was followed by another Uniat, Rouski, but in 1632 that robust champion of Orthodoxy, Peter Mogila, became Metropolitan of Kief[e].

Thus the Church of the Ukraine, or Western Russia, became split up into two parts. The rights and liberties of the Orthodox Church were guaranteed by Sigismond in the Uniat Synod of Brest. But the Polish Government soon took measures for the propagation of the Unia; and a violent and long-lasting persecution of the Orthodox set in. Sigismond's son and successor, Ladislaus IV., who, unlike his father, was a tolerant Ruler, re-enacted the Act which guaranteed the liberties of the Orthodox Church; but the Uniat nobility opposed its operation. The ancient Orthodox Liturgies were mutilated; the Orthodox bishops prevented from holding intercourse with their clergy; their priests dared not show themselves in public; their monks were expelled from the monasteries; their churches farmed to Jews. "In Vilna," says Mouravief, "the Orthodox churches were converted into inns—in Mensk the Church-lands were given to a Mahometan Mosque." Horrible atroci-

[e] See p. 345.

ties were perpetrated; "many priests," says Dr. Neale[f], "were baked and roasted alive, or torn in pieces by iron instruments." The Jesuits, under pretext of being Uniat monks, insinuated themselves into the families of the Lithuano-Russian nobility, till, in the seventeenth Century, says Ustrialof, "all the nobility of Western Russia were Uniats; of the remaining classes, the clergy and inhabitants of the towns and villages, one half preserved the faith of their ancestors, the other joined the schism.—Inimical to each other, both parties were equally persecuted and hunted down by the Roman Catholics, were deprived of civil rights, and were about to sink in a harassing struggle with implacable fanaticism[g]."

The Unia continued for nearly 250 years. It was brought about at a time when Roman Catholic Poland had a political importance far superior to that of Orthodox Russia. The religious bigotry of Sigismond III., fostered by the Jesuits, was the immediate cause of Poland's fall. The sixteenth Century and the reign of the first two Sigismonds was the Augustine age of Polish literature. At the close of the reign of Sigismond III., till the revival of learning in the latter half of the eighteenth Century, the period of the unlimited sway of the Jesuits, when they were the almost exclusive masters of the public schools in Poland, "literature," says Krasinski, "declined as rapidly as it had advanced during the previous Century." The withering effect of Jesuit influence accounts for the deterioration of the national intellect, which last "produced most pernicious effects on the political and social state of the country."

[f] Intro. I. 56.

[g] This last sentence refers to the time when, in the reign of Catharine II., the first return of the Uniats to the Orthodox Church took place.

With the death, without issue, of Feodor on June 1, 1598, the dynasty of Ruric came to an end, and on the 15th of the same month his pious widow, Irene, retired into a convent. At the request of the Boyars, supported by the Patriarch Job and his synod, Boris Godunof assumed the government, and was, on September 1, 1599, crowned Tsar by Job in the Cathedral of the Assumption. The Romanofs, of the family of Anastasia, the first wife of Ivan IV., he treated with much harshness; Feodor, the eldest member, was forced to become a monk (assuming the monastic name of Philaret), his wife Martha to take the veil, and their young son Michael (destined to become Tsar) was placed in confinement.

Although the reign of Boris was not unattended with glory, the early years of the seventeenth Century were to Russia a period of great anxiety. From 1601—1604 a famine, followed by a pestilence, devastated the country. Boris, having entrusted his young son Feodor to the care of Job, died suddenly in 1605; and soon after his death, what is known as *the Period of Troubles* followed.

For a short time Boris' son Feodor was Tsar. Already in the reign of Boris, the first false Dmitri (for there were several of the name, personating the young Prince who they pretended was not dead), had, under the patronage of Poland, bringing with him a number of Jesuits, made his appearance. He advanced to Moscow; on June 20, 1605, ascended the throne; and to him the fickle Boyars swore allegiance. He had been educated at the Jesuit College in Livonia; and he now wrote to Pope Paul V. (1605—1621), announcing his intention of bringing the Russian nation under the subjection of the Pope. Whilst Job was celebrating Mass in the Cathedral of the Assumption, a band of miscreants rushed in, and stripped

him of his robes, and putting on him the simple dress of a monk, consigned him to a monastery, where, infirm and blind, he died in 1606. Hermogenes, Metropolitan of Kazan, was appointed by the Orthodox Church his successor; Ignatius, formerly bishop of Cyprus, who, having been expelled by the Turks, had since 1603 been bishop of Riazan, being intruded by the opposite party. The young Tsar and his mother were murdered. This was the commencement of the troubles.

The impostor Dmitri conferred on Russia one benefit, in liberating the Romanofs; and the monk Philaret was consecrated Metropolitan of Rostof. On May 17, 1606, Dmitri was assassinated in an insurrection of the people; and the Orthodox Church was left unmolested by the Jesuits, who were expelled from Russia.

Into the political chaos by which Russia was convulsed during this troublous period—the succession of usurpers, invaders, and pretenders—from which Russia (after Sigismond's son, Ladislaus, had actually sat two years upon the throne) narrowly escaped annexation to Poland, it is not our province to enter. But, whilst confusion everywhere else existed, the Orthodox Church remained firm and consolidated, and the fidelity of the people to their Church never wavered. Not a single Russian priest or monk was known to favour the cause of the Pretenders; they knew that the success of the Pretenders, or a Polish Prince on the throne, meant Romanism in Russia; the Patriarch Hermogenes died a martyr in prison; and 800 monks of the Troitza Lavra died, during a sixteen months' siege, by the sword or sickness.

The Church, after many acts of heroism and martyrdom, brought the nation to the sense of its danger, and of its duty. The common people, who had all along been

sensible of their obligations to their Church, now reposed on it all their hopes; Dionysius, Archimandrite of the Troitza, induced the Boyars to act in unison in behalf of the Fatherland. The nation was again one; a three days' fast was proclaimed and rigidly observed. The famous butcher, Minin, put himself at the head of the national movement; in August, 1612, the army, guided by the bishops and monks and clergy, with the holy Icons borne before them, marched on Moscow; and the Poles, reduced to the direst straits of famine, were driven from the country. The Russian bishops, headed by the Archimandrite Dionysius, and attended by the clergy with Crosses and Icons, entered the Kremlin, the Archbishop of Archangel, bearing in his hands the venerated picture of the Virgin, coming out to meet them. The Period of Troubles was ended; Sigismond, who had hitherto little understood how deeply the Orthodox faith penetrates the whole existence of Russians, offered, when it was too late, that his son Ladislaus should conform to the Orthodox Greek Church. And just as it was the Orthodox Church which stood in the breach in those terrible years of usurpation and anarchy, so after order was restored, it was the Church that established the Romanof dynasty on the throne.

The most influential Russian was Philaret, Metropolitan of Rostof, head of the Romanof family, at the time a prisoner at Marienburg, whither he had been sent by the Germans, the recent allies of Poland. As he himself was debarred from the Tsardom, the General Assembly of Bishops, Boyars, and Delegates of the people, unanimously elected, in 1613, his son Michael, a youth fifteen years of age, recommended by the character of his father. The pseudo-Patriarch, Ignatius, managed to

escape to Poland ; and, in 1620, Philaret was consecrated Patriarch, in succession to Hermogenes, by Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who had been sent to Russia during its troubles by the sympathizing Church of Palestine, and was still in the country.

" Thus," says Mouravief, " was brought about an event remarkable in the annals of the world, which in no country nor in any time has been repeated, of a father as Patriarch and his son as Sovereign governing together in the Kingdom." The Patriarch Philaret, having raised the primatial see of Russia to a greater height of dignity and influence than it had ever known before, died A.D. 1633, and was succeeded by Joasaph I., Archbishop of Pskof.

The Tsar Michael dying in 1645, was succeeded by his son Alexis (1645—1676). Dr. Samuel Collins, Court Physician at Moscow for eight years, writing in 1672, thus describes the Tsar;—" He never misses divine service. . . . On Fasts he frequents midnight prayer, standing four, five, or six hours together, and prostrating himself on the ground, sometimes a thousand times, and on great festivals fifteen hundred. . . . No monk is more observant of canonical hours than he is of Fasts."

The principal ecclesiastical events of Alexis' reign centre round the six years' Patriarchate of Nicon, who, through his influence with the Tsar, may be said to have for a time ruled the State no less than the Church of Russia. Nicon was, like Cyril Lucar, a reformer ; and through his reforms he, the most famous of the Patriarchs of Moscow, met with a fate scarcely less tragical than that of the great Patriarch of Constantinople.

Born near Novgorod, the son of very humble parents, Nicon entered on a novitiate in the Jeltovodsky monastery, but at his father's request, he, without taking the

vows of a monk, left the monastery, married, and was ordained. After ten years of married life, and having lost all their children, he and his wife resolved to embrace the monastic life; Nicon became a monk in the desolate Lavra of Solovetsky, and eventually settled down as Hegumen at Novgorod. In 1649, requiring alms for his monastery, he visited Moscow, where he made the acquaintance of the gentle and religious but, as his after-life showed, the weak and stubborn Alexis. The Tsar was so pleased with what he saw and heard of his character, that he treated him with much reverence, followed his spiritual counsel, appointed him Archimandrite of the Novospasky monastery, and soon afterwards Metropolitan of Novgorod (1649—1652); Nicon being consecrated by Paisius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who, also in want of alms, had lately arrived at Moscow.

Nicon at once effected a much needed reformation, not only in the lives of the clergy, but also in Church-singing and services of the Diocese. The alterations gained for him anything but good will from the aged and old-fashioned Joseph, who, in 1642, had succeeded Joasaph as Patriarch of Moscow; equally objectionable were they to many of the rigidly-conservative presbyters. He was regarded as a despiser of Russian antiquity; they complained of his desiring too close an approximation of the Russian to the Church of Constantinople, which they maintained (no doubt in allusion to Cyril Lucar) had, in some respects, departed from primitive Orthodoxy.

During the several visits which Nicon paid to Moscow, he further increased his influence over the Tsar, no less in spiritual than civil matters. At the request of Alexis, who thought thus to obtain absolution for Ivan the Ter-

rible, he translated the remains of the martyred Metropolitan, St. Philip, to the Church of the Assumption at Moscow;—"To-day," says Beaulieu, "the silver shrine of the sainted bishop occupies one of the four corners of the Cathedral of the Assumption at Moscow, the place of honour in Russian Churches, and the Russian sovereigns come to kiss the relics of the old Tsar's victim."

Scarcely had the translation been effected than the Patriarchal throne of Moscow, vacant through the death of Joseph, was conferred upon Nicon. Whether the appointment to the highest post in the Russian Church of a man of low birth, defective education, and ignorant of Greek, was judicious, is open to doubt. Nicon, who knew that the Boyars were ill-disposed towards him, with unfeigned reluctance accepted the Patriarchate, having extorted a promise from them and the Government that they would loyally follow him in spiritual matters.

Orthodoxy and a love of the Orthodox Church has always been a characteristic of the Russian nation; and we have seen how the almost miraculous deliverance of Russia, in the troublous times of Job and Hermogenes, was due to its inborn hatred of Latinism. There can be no doubt that when Nicon became Patriarch, great irregularities prevailed in the Russian Church. The churches stood empty at great solemnities; the higher clergy did not celebrate the Eucharist for months together; the lower clergy were addicted to drinking, and even worse vices; preaching was altogether disused, except when an occasional sermon was preached by the Patriarch; and Nicon himself had to insist that candidates for Orders should be able to read [h].

[h] Mouravief, p. 215.

Nicon determined on a general reformation; and he took the Churches of Constantinople as his model, with too little regard to Russian susceptibilities.

In addition to the other difficulties with which Nicon, as a reformer, had to contend, there was the interminable one with regard to the Service-books. Notwithstanding the revision of Maximus, through the work having been cut short by his cruel treatment, many errors still existed. One of the subjects brought before the Synod of the Hundred Chapters was the revision of the Service-books; but the ignorance of the clergy and the prejudice against corrections prevented anything being done. Ivan the Terrible had, as before stated, introduced the printing-press into Moscow; but, owing to these causes, its use was hampered. The task was resumed, but with no better success, under the Patriarch Job, in the reign of Feodor. In the reign of Michael, by the advice of Theophanes, Patriarch of Jerusalem, it was entrusted to Dionysius, the Archimandrite of the Troitza Lavra[1]; but it only exposed him to the censure of the ignorant, and the patriotic Archimandrite was thrown into prison.

With the experience of former failures, it could not have appeared to Nicon a promising undertaking; but he determined to resume it where it had been broken off by Maximus; and in 1654 the Tsar assembled a synod at Moscow, to consider the revision. The Tsar himself presided, and the synod was attended by Nicon, four Metropolitans, five Archbishops, eleven Archimandrites, and thirteen Hegumens, Arch-priests and Protopopes. Nicon pointed out that, during the calamitous state of the Eastern Church, when all communication between

[1] See above.

Russia and Constantinople had been cut off, many interpolations and errors, at variance with the ancient Greek and Slavic copies, had, through the ignorance of copyists and printers, crept into the Service-books; and that the present books were widely different from those used by SS. Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and other Greek Fathers. A revision was accordingly determined on. It was agreed that the old Greek and Slavic Books should be taken as the guide, and that the primitive use should be restored; and the Tsar wrote to the Patriarch of Constantinople, asking him to request the co-operation and advice of the other Patriarchs.

In accordance with the request of the Tsar, a synod of Greek bishops, under Paisius, Patriarch of Constantinople, confirmed the decision of the Moscow synod; and Paisius wrote to Nicon that, whilst not one word should be taken from nor added to the Nicene Creed, the *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Mogila should be adopted as a correct statement of the doctrine of the Eastern Church. At the same time he gave him the salutary advice, which Nicon appears not to have followed, to practise indulgence for the feelings of those who differed in merely external matters.

To assist in the revision, Nicon invited monks from Constantinople and Mount Athos, and collected from all parts Greek MSS.; about 500 were sent from Mount Athos, many of them 700 years old, whilst the Patriarchs contributed a large number of similar antiquity. These Nicon caused to be translated into the Slavic language.

The Greek and Slavic versions were then compared, with the result that many mistakes and interpolations were found to have been introduced into the Russian books; this was the case even in the Nicene Creed;

and a much needed correction was effected. A synod, convoked in the following year by Nicon, at which Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch, and Gabriel of Servia were present, confirmed the previous synod, and approved the revision. The "Old Books" were called in and "New Books" adopted. The revision was effected by the Church, but the New Books were rendered compulsory by the civil power; thus it was that the Church, as reformed by Nicon, came to be considered the State Church, as opposed to the old, the people's Church.

The revision, whilst from the less ignorant part of the secular clergy it met with general approval, was loudly condemned by an overwhelming majority of the lower and more ignorant classes; as well as by the monks. The ignorant amongst the clergy mistook the interpolations which encumbered the old books for the original text, and deemed them something sacred. The ignorant part of the laity followed the ignorance of their priests; and the hand that had dared to tamper with the sacred books was declared sacrilegious. Monks, priests, deacons denounced the corrections as concessions to Protestantism or Romanism. Nicon was a Lutheran, a Calvanist, a Romanist; in one respect they agreed, that he was the enemy of the Orthodox Church, and had introduced a new religion. They found allies in several bishops, headed by Paul of Colonna, who at the Moscow synod had opposed the revision; they objected to revision altogether, on the ground that religion, not only in its essence, but also in its accidents, is unchangeable; the Church had become Babylon, and Nicon was a forerunner of Antichrist.

Nicon was probably, of men of note, the most unpopular man in Russia. The Patriarchate of Moscow

increased his unpopularity; it had reached a height incompatible with the position of a cleric, and, as his more able son Peter the Great realized more fully than Alexis, was also incompatible with the well-being of the State. From the first the Patriarchs of Moscow, although they were perfectly loyal to and accepted their supremacy in ecclesiastical matters, were practically independent of the Patriarchs of Constantinople. They were chosen (although in this respect Nicon was an exception) from the richest and noblest families in the land; they became the possessors of extensive domains, which put them almost on a level with the Tsars, whom, even in civil matters, they could and often did oppose. Next to the Tsar, they held the highest rank in Russia, so that, not from any direct act of legislature, but from the respect of the people for their office, neither war could be proclaimed nor peace concluded without their sanction; and his failure in a recent campaign against the Swedes, Alexis attributed to the advice given to him by Nicon.

No wonder that the Patriarchs of Moscow, charged with duties alien to their office, grew haughty and overbearing; and under Nicon the Patriarchate reached its zenith. The confidence reposed in him by the Tsar, who conferred on him the title of *Great Lord*, added to the difficulties which his too exalted dignity created; the Boyars regarded it with jealousy; whilst the Tsaritza resented Nicon's influence over her husband. Not only had Alexis made him Godfather of all his children, but in his absence, during two compaigns against the Poles, had entrusted him, over the heads of the Boyars, with the regency of the Kingdom. It was through Nicon that Kief and the Ukraine were, without a drop of blood being shed, brought back under Russian dominion; that

the schools of the Jesuits were abolished; and the Cossacks of the Dnieper, the subjects of the hated Unia in Poland, became an integral part of the Russian Empire.

Nicon was not a judicious man. Some Boyars had brought home from the Polish wars Latin Icons, and had, in imitation of the Latins, erected organs in their private houses; these he ordered to be burnt, as inconsistent with Greek Orthodoxy.

To an ordinary Catholic some trivialities, where no doctrine was involved, which beset the Russian mind, would appear unworthy of notice; yet in such matters Nicon sacrificed the good which the revision of the Service-books might have effected, by insisting on a minute conformity with other branches of the Greek Church. The Russian people were in the habit of crossing themselves in one manner, the other Greeks in another; Nicon insisted on the Greek custom; the "Old Believers" maintained that Christ and His Apostles gave the blessing with the fingers extended in a certain position, and that their form was Syrian-Greek, whilst Nicon's was Byzantine-Greek. The Russians celebrated Mass with seven prosphers, the other Greeks with five. The Greeks sang the Hallelujah three times, the Russians only twice. For such trifles the ignorant masses were ready to encounter tortures and death, rather than abandon them; and yet in such trifles Nicon insisted on exact conformity with Constantinople.

So long as Nicon possessed the favour of the Tsar, he was able to bear up against the opposition which the revision of the Books encountered. The cause of the estrangement between him and Alexis is not known; but after the return of the Tsar from his two years

campaign against the Poles, Nicon learnt that the Tsar could dispense with his services.

Having now to encounter the hostility of the Tsar and Boyars, Nicon resolved to retire from the Patriarchate, publicly announcing his intention in the Cathedral of Moscow, and leaving his crozier in the Church; and assuming the dress of a Kaloir, he retired to Vosresenk, where he was building a monastery to be called the *New Jerusalem*, with a church on the model of that of the Holy Sepulchre. This abandonment of the Patriarchate was converted by the Boyars into a State-offence, and many vague accusations, one of anathematizing the Tsar, were brought against him.

Returning after a time to Moscow, Nicon thought to resume the Patriarchate; but, finding the feeling against him too strong, he resigned the office, and consented to the appointment of a successor. He wrote to Dionysius, Patriarch of Constantinople, defending himself against all accusations from the first days of his Patriarchate, and enumerating the wrongs he had suffered. This letter being intercepted formed the ground of a fresh accusation.

After the struggle had continued eight years, and there was practically no Patriarch of Moscow, the Tsar wrote to the four Eastern Patriarchs requesting them to appoint a court of Metropolitans, to examine the charges brought against Nicon. In vain Nectarius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, interceded with Alexis, to remember his former services, and restore Nicon. A synod of Greeks and Russians (the most important, says Mouravief, ever held in Russia), presided over by Paisius, Patriarch of Alexandria, and Macarius III. of Antioch, met at Moscow in 1666. The accusations brought against Nicon were:

(1) of having abandoned the Patriarchate; (2) by so doing bringing disaster on the Church; (3) displeasing the Tsar, and contending against the synod; (4) uncanonically appointing to the Archbishopric of Gaza; (5) interdicting several bishops without consulting his synod; (6) treating his subordinates with extreme severity.

The synod held its last sitting in December; and, in the following January, the sentence, in which the two absent Patriarchs concurred, was pronounced in the presence of the Tsar; that Nicon should be deposed and degraded, and do penance in a monastery for the remainder of his life, as a common Kaloir.

By this synod the Archbishopric of Siberia, which had been established by the Patriarch Philaret, was, together with the Archiepiscopal see of Riazan, raised to Metropolitan rank; Astrachan was made a separate Metropolate, and several new sees were created. The synod also abrogated the acts of The Hundred-Chapter synod, and abolished the practice of re-baptizing Christian converts.

The synod of 1666, whilst it condemned Nicon, approved his revision of the Service-books, and anathematized its opponents. The long-standing schism with regard to the Books now broke out with re-doubled force, and the opposition of the Staroviertsi, or "Old Believers," rent the Russian Church in twain. Nor did the fact that the synod had the approval of all the Eastern Patriarchs mitigate the calamity. It was maintained that Greek and Syrian bishops, as they knew nothing of the Slavic language, were incompetent to pronounce a judgment on Slavic Books. Having before them the schism of the Unia, they believed it was a subtle attempt of the Pope of Rome to subject the Russian Church to his obedience.

One bishop, Paul of Colonna, who had previously sided with them, had been degraded by Nicon ; (this was one of the charges brought against Nicon at his trial ;) Paul was now, by order of a synod, consigned to a monastery, in which he died. The opposition to Nicon's reforms found a leader in a priest of Moscow, named Nicetas, who took the head of the Strigolniks. He, and the ringleaders of the party, having been executed in 1672, two priests, Cosma and Stephen, headed another schism ; but, warned by the fate of Nicetas, they left Moscow, and founded a settlement at Staradubofsk in the Ukraine, on the borders of Poland ; and soon afterwards another at Vetka.

Nicon, immediately after his condemnation, went in to banishment, during which he was treated with much cruelty, the half-penitent Tsar mitigating it as far as was within his power. Alexis died in 1676, asking, when on the point of death, Nicon's forgiveness and absolution. The former Nicon (although his answer did not reach Moscow till after the Tsar's death) readily granted ; the public wrong, he said, was beyond his power to remit.

Nicon lived in his monastic imprisonment under three Patriarchs of Moscow, Joasaph II. (1667—1672) ; Pitirim, who held the Patriarchate only ten months ; and Joachim (1673 — 1690), the last but one of the Patriarchs of Moscow.

Alexis was succeeded by his son Feodor II. (1676—1682), the Godson of Nicon. In 1681, the young Tsar gave an order for the liberation of Nicon, with permission to retire to his convent of the New Jerusalem at Vosresenk, the building of which had been suspended during Nicon's banishment. Nicon was now released, but on his homeward journey he died. The Patriarch Joachim re-

fusing him the honours usual at the funeral of a Patriarch of Moscow, the ceremony was, at the request of the Tsar, performed by the Metropolitan of Novgorod, and Feodor obtained from the four Greek Patriarchs a full rehabilitation of Nicon's character.

That Nicon was the greatest of the Patriarchs of Moscow, will readily be allowed ; but between his panegyrists and opponents, it is difficult to arrive at a just estimate of his character. He has been called the Thomas Becket of Russian Orthodoxy. To him the office of a priest was higher than an Emperor's crown ; the Tsar was anointed by the Church, and that a Patriarch should derive his power through the Tsar, was to Nicon a fearful blasphemy. He was a reformer, when reform was much needed ; but when all members of society were either too ignorant to appreciate his learning, or too worldly to understand his motives. His fall was primarily due to the jealousy of the Boyars of the Patriarchate of Moscow, the splendour of which had been greatly enhanced through the Tsar Michael's affection for his father Philaret, who practically ruled as Tsar. Nicon's faults were those of an injudicious man with a stiff and domineering temper. He was the victim of a weak Monarch, who stood by him when all was well, and would have stood by him to the last, if Nicon had been on the winning side ; in the unequal conflict between Church and State, of which he was the inaugurator in Russia, he fared the worst, and posterity condemns the vanquished. His defeat was fraught with important consequences to the Russian Church ; for it paved the way to the abolition of the Patriarchate of Moscow, which, before his time, contained the seeds of its own dissolution.

CHAPTER IV.

The Russian Church under the Holy Governing Synod.

In 1721, the Tsar, Peter the Great, created, when on a visit to England, D.C.L. of Oxford, abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow, and substituted in its place *The Holy Governing Synod*, with Patriarchal rank.

A pleasing anecdote is told of Peter in connection with St. Metrophanes, a zealous maintainer of Orthodoxy, and the last of the Russian Saints[a]. The usual punishment for wilful disobedience of a Tsar's order was death. When Peter, previously to his campaign against Azof, was reviewing his fleet at Vironege, of which Metrophanes was bishop, he ordered him into his presence. Metrophanes refused, until Peter should remove from the room a statue of Venus, and prepared for what he expected, certain death. So far from being offended, Peter ordered the offensive statue to be removed, and the interview then took place.

Whether, as an ecclesiastical reformer, Peter acted from other than political motives, may be open to doubt. Having effected a reformation in the State, he, finding that disorder existed in the Church, felt it his duty, "after the example of religious Kings in the Old and New Testaments," to regulate that also; lest, "when the great Judge should demand an account of the trust committed to us," he should be unable to give an answer.

[a] Canonized A.D. 1832.

The Patriarch Joachim was succeeded by Adrian (1690—1700), Metropolitan of Riazan, a feeble prelate, entirely out of harmony with the times, and the creative genius of the Tsar. The aged prelate had outlived his faculties, the duties of the Patriarchate having to be performed by a vicar, Triphyllius, Metropolitan of Sarai.

In May, 1703, Peter laid, on the banks of the Neva, the first stone of Petersburg; "a window" he called it, "from which he could look out on the Western world." Knowing the reverence in which Russians hold their monasteries, he translated thither the remains of St. Alexander Nevski, and around his shrine a vast monastery soon sprung up, rivalling in grandeur those of the Troitza and Pechersky.

There is no question that under Nicon the Patriarchate of Moscow had attained an excessive, and perhaps dangerous, height. Himself the great-grandson of the Patriarch Philaret, Peter knew that, whilst the Tsar reigned, Philaret ruled; he remembered also how the last days of his own father, Alexis, had been embittered by contention with Nicon.

Persuaded that the government of the Church by many was better than an ecclesiastical monarchy, Peter determined, on the death of Adrian in 1700, to abolish, by his own authority, the Patriarchate of Moscow. He abolished it first, and sought the sanction of the Eastern Patriarchs afterwards. At the same time he proceeded cautiously, first teaching the nation to do without a Patriarch, with a view to which he appointed a Guardian, under the title of Exarch.

To aid him in his civil and military reforms, Peter had employed foreigners; he now availed himself of Russians, educated in the Academy of Kief, the intellectual centre

of the Empire. The Academy was at the time presided over by Theophanes Procopovich, a man of profound learning both secular and ecclesiastical ; whilst Barlaam, the Metropolitan of Kief, was a zealous promoter of learning.

At Kief was educated Stephen Javorsky, who, having been sent to Moscow on business by Barlaam, was detained by Peter, and appointed Metropolitan of Riazan, and now, as Guardian of the Patriarchate, Exarch. Theophanes Procopovich was appointed Archbishop of Pskof.

Considering the burden too onerous for one individual, Peter, in January, 1721, determined to abolish the Exarchate, and in a full assembly of the most eminent Russian clergy, by his own authority, appointed an Ecclesiastical College, which eventually took the name of the *Holy Governing Synod*, of which Stephen Javorsky was the first Chief-Procurator, continuing to hold the office till his death two years afterwards. To Theophanes Procopovich was entrusted by the Tsar the task of drawing up a "Spiritual Regulation" for the guidance of the new College.

The Russian Church had nothing to fear from Rome, for the Unia had so embittered Russian feeling that, says Mouravief, there was no fear from that quarter. But a wave of Luthero-Calvinism was breaking over the land, the result of the teaching of German and other foreigners whom Peter had introduced into Russia ; who, by their assertion of the right of private judgment, created confusion and irreverence, and gave much trouble to Stephen Javorsky. To counteract such views, and in defence of the Orthodox Church, Stephen wrote a work entitled *The Rock of Faith.* Theophanes, when head of the

Academy of Kief, had manifested Lutheran tendencies; his promotion to the Archbishopric of Pskof was viewed by the Exarch with dismay, and drew from him a pastoral rebuke. This, however, Theophanes disregarded; and continued to disseminate unorthodox views, after he became Archbishop. Besides *The Spiritual Regulation*, Theophanes was the author of the *Answer to the Fathers of the Sorbonne*, of which mention will be made further on in this chapter; and of a Catechism which received the authority of the synod of 1721.

The *Spiritual Regulation* was subscribed by the Nobles both spiritual and temporal, by the Archimandrites and Hegumens of the principal monasteries; in all ninety-five persons; and confirmed by Peter. An Appendix, likewise by Theophanes, was subscribed in a similar manner. The Regulation set forth the reasons which induced Peter to abolish the Patriarchate. It stated that a synod is better suited than a single individual to arrange matters; that, being under the direction of the Tsar, there could be no intrigues nor rebellion; whereas the vulgar, not discerning the difference between the spiritual and temporal governments, were apt to be dazzled by the dignity of the Primate, and to think him equal to the Emperor.

The members of the new Synod, who were appointed by the Tsar himself, were required to swear that they would in all things act conformably to the rules and canons of the *Spiritual Regulation;* that they would be his faithful subjects, and acknowledge that the Tsar is "the supreme head of the Spiritual College."

The Most Holy Governing Synod of All the Russias (the title of the new College), has its seat at Petersburg, which Peter made the political, although in the eyes of many Russians, Moscow continued to be the National, capital.

The first Synod consisted, in all, of twelve members, Bishops, Archimandrites, Hegumens, with one Presbyter to represent the Black, and two Archpriests the White, clergy.

After the Holy Synod was constituted, Peter, "that the unity of the Church might not be violated," says Mouravief, wrote to Jeremias III., Patriarch of Constantinople, asking his recognition of it, and that of the other Eastern Patriarchs. Mouravief calls attention to the fact that one Jeremias was Patriarch when the Patriarchate of Moscow was constituted, another when it was abolished. What could the Patriarchs, oppressed as they were with poverty, with their subjection to the Turks, and often requiring pecuniary assistance, do against the settled determination of the powerful Tsar? They connived at the *fait accompli.* On September 23, 1723, Jeremias wrote signifying his approval; which was soon followed by that of the other Patriarchs. In his letter Jeremias exhorted and enjoined the Russian Church to hold inviolably the customs and canons of the Seven Œcumenical Councils, and all besides that the Holy Eastern Church acknowledges and preserves; as well as the *Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem,* of which, says Mr. Palmer[b], every Church in Russia is expected to have a copy.

The Holy Governing Synod is dignified with the title of Sobor, the name which is given to the Œcumenical Councils; and it is inserted in the Ectænia (which nearly corresponds to our Litany), and Prayers of the Russian Church, where the Patriarch of Moscow was previously mentioned. At the head is the Ober-Prokuror, who is

[b] *Visit to the Russian Church.*

always a layman, to act, in Peter's words, as "the eye of the Sovereign."

In the present day the number of the Holy Synod is not limited, and it is almost wholly comprised of prelates, some of whom are appointed for a time, some permanently. Amongst the former are Archbishops, Bishops, and Archimandrites, these last to represent the monastic or Black clergy. There are also two Secular or White clergy, one being the Tsar's Confessor, the other the Chief Chaplain of the army and navy. Amongst the permanent and ex-officio members, are the Metropolitans of Moscow and Kief, and of the combined sees of Petersburg and Novgorod; and the Church of Georgia is represented by its Exarch, who is a permanently elected member of the Synod.

At one end of the table where the Synod sits, is a Cross and a Book of the Gospels; at the other the throne of the Tsar, who claims the right, exercised by the Emperors when they summoned and presided over Œcumenical Councils, of himself presiding. He is, however, generally represented by the Procurator; in purely ecclesiastical and doctrinal matters, as to which the Tsar is as a private individual, the Procurator has no voice; but without him, no act of the Synod becomes law. In the election of bishops, each member is required by the Spiritual Regulation to write down the name of the person whom he recommends; and when two, or not more than three, are agreed on, they are to be presented by the Procurator to the Tsar, who determines who is to be appointed. But the Tsar reserves to himself the right of rejecting the nominees, and of nominating whomsoever he thinks proper; and him the Synod is bound to elect. Nor, in this respect, does the Tsar claim other rights

over the Russian than he exercises over other Churches within his dominions. In 1847 an agreement was drawn up with Rome, regulating the position of Roman Catholic bishops in Russia; all direct communication between Rome and its bishops was forbidden, and could only be conducted through the department of Foreign Affairs at Petersburg; Roman Catholic bishops were to be nominated by the Tsar, the Pope, if he approved, ratifying the appointment.

The Orthodox States, which, in the nineteenth century, resulted from the dismemberment of Turkey, have all followed the example of Russia, in instituting a Synod to act under the Sovereign in spiritual matters, the head, if little more than nominal, being the Patriarch of Constantinople. So that, given the abolition of the Patriarchate of Moscow, and the present impossibility of holding an Œcumenical Council, the plan of a Governing Synod may be taken as being as good a one as could be devised; and it has Peter's maxim to recommend it, viz., that the government by many is less liable to error than a monarchical government.

In the Russian Empire there are about seventy dioceses, and all prelates are subject to the Synod. The prelates who sit in the Synod are always able men; three Metropolitans of Moscow of the nineteenth Century, Plato, Philaret, and Macarius, will bear comparison with any Western bishops; nor are those of Petersburg far behind. And of the Russian episcopate may be said, what, unfortunately, in consequence of its miserable subjection to the Turks, cannot be said of the Greek Church generally, viz., that it is free from simony.

Subordinate to the Holy Synod are the Consistorial Courts; subordinate again to the Consistorial Courts are

the Courts called Cantoirs. Appeals lie from the Cantoir, first to the Consistorial Court, next to the bishops themselves, and finally to the Holy Synod, which, through the Procurator, is accountable to the Tsar. The highest classes of monasteries, the Lavras and Stauropegias, are immediately subject to the Synod ; whilst the lower monasteries are subject to the bishop ; the difference being due to the circumstance that the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries are generally taken from the former.

The abolition of the Patriarchate of Moscow, affected the external discipline of the Russian Church ; it did not touch, much less destroy, Russian Orthodoxy ; nor, if arbitrary, was it of the Erastian character with which people sometimes charge it. At the inauguration of the Synod, Peter is reported to have said, " I am your Patriarch." In Russia a quasi-sacerdotal character attaches to the Tsar. At his coronation in the Church of the Assumption at Moscow, he places the crown on his own head ; and passing into the Sanctuary takes from the Holy Table the consecrated bread and wine. On the spot in Petersburg where, in 1886, the Tsar Alexander I. escaped assassination, the words are written in letters of gold, " Touch not mine anointed ; " and an address presented to the same Tsar, after a similar escape in 1887, sets forth : " The law of the Lord teaches us that Sovereigns are appointed and consecrated by God Himself—the Sovereign is the image of God Himself."

Such language may seem extravagant, but it explains the meaning of Peter's words. The relation between the spiritual and temporal powers in Russia is the same that has prevailed ever since the time of Constantine the Great. In Russia the Orthodox Church is a check on the Tsar, rather than the Tsar on the Church. Peter

never tried to modify any dogma, nor interfered in any but the external arrangement of the Church; if a Tsar were prompted to interfere in matters of doctrine, he would be restrained by the fear of shocking the popular feeling. If a Tsar like Paul (1796—1801) arrogated an excessive power over the Church, it was an unconstitutional claim, the act of a madman, as Paul probably was. The suppression of the Patriarchate by Peter was not more unconstitutional than the continued suppression of Convocation by the English Parliament; secular Rulers in other countries have plundered the Church; Peter the Great plundered it; Peter III., who despised the Icons and was really a Lutheran, plundered it more; and Catharine II., whilst she pretended to favour Orthodoxy, completed the spoliation. The Tsar, a high Russian official told Mr. Palmer, is the governor of a mighty Empire, but to interfere in the internal matters of the Russian Church was more than his throne is worth [c]. No Russian, no Orthodox Greek, holds that a temporal Sovereign, except in external matters, is head of the Church; there is only one head under Christ, and that is an Œcumenical Council.

From the abolition of the Patriarchate, and the creation of a new capital, Peter's reforms descended to the minutest details of Russian every-day life, and they stirred up opposition amongst all classes of society. The root of the matter was the supplanting "Holy Moscow" by a new capital, which Peter's enemies devoutly hoped the inundations of 1705 and 1721 would destroy. The computation of time, not as before, from the creation of the world, but, according to Western custom, from the Birth

[c] Palmer's *Visit to the Russian Church.*

of Christ; the change in the commencement of the year from September 1 to January 1; the introduction of Newspapers into Petersburg; the alteration in the dress of men; the withdrawal of veils from women; the order that laymen should shave their chins; the taxation of beards; these and such like matters might be considered to appertain to civil arrangement. But, strange to say, even in the Orthodox Church, they were associated with the reforms of Nicon; many who accepted Nicon's reforms, but were unwilling to advance further, regarded them as an attempt to revolutionize Russia, and considered them in the light of a religious grievance. Many in consequence left the Orthodox Church, and thus increased the ranks of the Raskolniks.

To the Staroviertsi, or "Old Believers," they were particularly odious, as associated in their minds with Nicon's reforms. Peter introduced the census into Russia; the Staroviertsi held that God only had a right to keep a register; and they instanced David's punishment. Peter was fond of his pipe, which, in his father Alexis's time, would have cost a man his nose. European customs they condemned wholesale; tobacco, even tea, coffee, sugar and potatoes, were the invention of Antichrist. Nicon had been the forerunner of Antichrist, Peter was Antichrist himself. Even Peter's victories, after his previous defeats, were attributed to the agency of the evil one; all the evil predictions of the Prophets, and the denunciations of Revelation were applied to Russia.

We have before noticed the abortive attempt, in which Peter interested himself, made by the English Non-jurors for a union with the Orthodox Greek Church. A more hopeful correspondence was carried on between the Non-jurors and the Russian Church. On October 8, 1717, the

Non-jurors wrote to Peter, thanking him for his encouragement of the movement, and begging its continuance, On May 30, 1722, they wrote to the Holy Governing Synod, expressing the hope that their Lordships would second their endeavours; and on the following day they wrote to Count Golovkin, Chancellor of Russia, thanking him for his advocacy of their cause, and requesting his further countenance and assistance.

In February, 1723, the Holy Governing Synod wrote to the Non-jurors, acknowledging their letter of May 30 in the preceding year. They assured them that they received it with great joy in the spirit; that they gave glory to Christ, that they had at heart a desire for concord with the Oriental Church, and thanking them for the expression of their goodwill and veneration for the Holy Synod. They told them that they had acquainted the Tsar with the proceedings, and that he regarded them with much favour. The Tsar proposed that the Non-jurors should send two of their body to Russia, to consult with the Synod, in the Name and Spirit of Christ, so that the opinions and arguments of both Churches might be weighed and considered, and that it might be decided what could be yielded by one side or the other, and what for conscience' sake must be retained.

On August 26, 1723, the Archbishop of Thebais wrote from Moscow to the Non-jurors, acquainting them that the Tsar and the Holy Synod had received their letters and replies to the Eastern Patriarchs with great joy, for that they thought nothing more desirable than the union of the Church of Christ. He also informed them of the Tsar's wish that two of their brethren should be sent to Russia.

On February 2, 1724, the Holy Synod addressed to

the Non-jurors a second letter, stating that the departure of the Protosyncellus, to whom they entrusted their previous letter, had been hitherto delayed. They inform them that the Tsar still remained of the same opinion; they renewed their request that the Non-jurors would send the envoys.

On July 13, 1724, the Non-jurors acknowledged the letters of the Holy Synod which rendered the position "not unpromising;" and saying that, God willing, they would send to Russia two of their brethern in the following Spring. They wrote at the same time to the Russian Chancellor acknowledging the Tsar's condescension, and his recommendation of a conference for concerting terms of union.

On March 8, 1725, intelligence reached England of Peter's death. Peter was succeeded by his widow, Catharine I.; and, on September 16, the Chancellor Golovkin wrote to the Non-jurors that he would take the earliest opportunity of bringing the union before her Majesty who, they might rest assured, would give it the same support as had been given by the late Tsar.

The schismatical character of the Non-jurors, writing under the fictitious title of bishops and Metropolitans of the Anglican Church, was, as before mentioned, exposed by Archbishop Wake, and the Non-juring movement collapsed.

When, in 1717, Peter the Great visited Paris, the Fathers of the Sorbonne presented him with a memorial, setting forth the points of agreement between the Russian and Gallican Churches, and proposing a Union, after the manner of the Uniats. They dwelt on the liberties of the Gallican Church; they declared that the Pope had no primacy of jurisdiction, but only of honour; they

denied his infallibility, and held him to be amenable to Councils.

This memorial of the Gallican Church Peter submitted to Stephen Javorsky and the Holy Synod. The synodal answer was drawn up by Theophanes Procopovich; it expressed the desire of the Russian Church for union, for which it constantly prayed; but such a union could only be effected by an agreement between the whole of Eastern and Western Christendom.

The cordial feeling with which the Russian Church greeted the proposed union between the Russian and Anglican Churches stands in marked contrast with its thinly-veiled disfavour towards a union with the Gallican Church on the example of the Uniats, and the recognition of the Pope as in any sense the first bishop in Christendom. The proposed union with the Anglican Church the Holy Synod received "with great joy in the Spirit." In future negotiations (and we think that in no great length of time they may be renewed), there will be the common starting-point of mutual good-will between the two Churches.

Since the Holy Governing Synod of Russia comprises under its Patriarchal jurisdiction a far larger number of Orthodox Christians, than the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem taken together, Russia may be regarded as the natural protector of the Greek Church. If England saw her co-religionists in countries that look to her for help, subjected to the cruelties which Orthodox Greeks suffer from the Turks, she would be the first to interfere, and would resent foreign interference. More than 300 years ago, says Mr. Taylor[d], an ambassador at the Turkish

[d] *Russia after the War*, p. 271.

Court, declared that the great Suleiman regarded the Russian Grand Prince with alarm, because he belonged to the same Church as Bulgaria, Bosnia, Servia, the Morea, and Greece. Turkey itself can scarcely imagine that the reign of tyranny, with its watchword the Koran, the tribute, or the sword, will be eternal, or that she will be allowed to prosecute for ever Christian nations which it conquered by force, now that it has lost the force necessary to retain them.

That the existence in Europe of a persecuting nation of infidels is due to the rivalry of Christian nations, is the scandal of modern Christendom. But, avoiding politics as far as possible, we will follow briefly the course of events which, in the period covered by this chapter, have led to better times for the Greeks, the decadence and dismemberment of Turkey, and the protectorate given to Russia by the Treaty of Kainardji.

Every country lost to Turkey is a gain to Christianity. The turn in the tide of Ottoman prosperity may be dated from the crushing defeat of the Turks, in 1682, by the Polish King, John Sobieski, under the walls of Vienna. By the Treaty of Carlowitz which followed, Turkey surrendered to Austria all the territory it had conquered from it during two centuries, including nearly the whole of Hungary, with Transilvania and part of Slavonia in addition; to Venice the Morea; the Ukraine and port of Moldavia to the Poles; and Azof to Russia.

The wars of Turkey with Christian nations continued through the eighteenth century, when Turkey gained back much that it had lost. By the Treaty of the Pruth in 1711, Azof was restored to Turkey; and in 1715 Venice had to cede to it the Morea. All the extensive conquests of Prince Eugene, which were confirmed by the Treaty

of Passarowitz in 1718, reverted to Turkey, the year after his death, by the Peace of Belgrade in 1739, when Belgrade, Servia, Bosnia, and Wallachia were surrendered to the Turks.

In 1769, Russia defeated Turkey on the banks of the Dniester in a war of the latter's seeking, and, to the great joy of the Christian population, the Turks were driven out of Moldavia and Wallachia. In the following year, 15,000 Russians defeated 150,000 Turks in the Battle of Kagoul, on the banks of the Pruth. In 1771 the Russians annihilated the Turkish fleet on the coast of Asia, and, but for an outbreak of the plague, Constantinople would probably have fallen.

With the Treaty of Kainardji in 1774, proudly dictated by Catharine II. on her own terms, a new era in the emancipation of the Greek Church opened. By Art. VII. Turkey promised to defend the Orthodox Christians; Art. XIV. allowed Russia to build a Church at Constantinople, which was to be under its protection. Azof was restored to Russia, the Crimea rendered independent, and the Black Sea and the passage of the Dardanelles was opened to its traffic. When the nations of Europe were beginning to interfere in behalf of Turkey, Catharine II. announced that she would allow no interference, and openly spoke of restoring at Constantinople a Greek Empire under the Russian monarchy.

In 1789 Belgrade was captured by Austria; by the Treaty of Sistova in 1791 the wars between Austria and Turkey came to an end, with the result that Hungary was completely freed from Turkey, but Bosnia and Servia were left in its clutches.

In July, 1789, the French Revolution broke out, and for a time Russia and Turkey were allies. By the Treaty

of Campo Formio in 1797, the Ionian Islands were ceded by the Venetians to France, but in 1800 were captured by a Turco-Russian fleet.

In the reign of Peter the Great, the decadence of Poland, which was accelerated by the oppression and cruelty of the Jesuits, commenced. Religious fanaticism reached its height in the judicial murder in 1724 of the Protestants at Thorn, which, and their subsequent exclusion from all public offices, sent a thrill of horror and indignation through Europe; in the reign of Augustus III. (1733—1764), the condition of the non-Roman population in Poland had become melancholy in the extreme, and called forth the interference of foreign Powers. During that reign Poland had been in a state of subservience to Russia, who, in succession to Augustus, placed Stanislaus Poniatowski on the throne. In 1772, the first partition of Poland, between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, was effected; the second, between Russia and Prussia, in 1793; and the "finis Poloniæ" was, by a third partition between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, effected in 1795. In that year Poniatowski resigned the throne, and in 1798 died broken-hearted at Petersburg.

Such was the fate of religious bigotry, the result of the entrance of the Jesuits into Poland. Catholic Poland, as an independent nation, ceased to exist; whilst Orthodox Russia, with a population of some ninety million souls, rules over the ninth part of the globe.

It has been mentioned how, by two disreputable bishops, from interested motives, and actuated by Sigismond III., the Roman Catholic King of Poland, the Unia was introduced into the Church of Western Russia; the schism by which members of the Greek Church were allowed to follow their own doctrines and ritual, on con-

dition of their abandoning their Patriarch, and acknowledging the supremacy of the Pope. No sooner had they, after the first partition of Poland in the reign of Catharine II., gained toleration, and were at liberty to follow the dictates of their own consciences, than between two and three million Uniats, mostly from Volhynia and Podolia, threw off the Roman, and returned to their Orthodox, allegiance.

The shadow of independence which Russia gave to Poland, and which was continued under the Tsar Alexander I. (1801—1825), only stimulated the Poles with the hope of re-establishing their complete independence; this was nurtured by private societies, with the result that the Tsar Alexander at his death left to his successor, Nicolas I. (1825—1855), the legacy of the Polish insurrection of 1830, preceded only a few days by the Revolution in France, which drove Charles X. from the throne. The result was that, in 1832, the Kingdom of Poland was made an integral part of the Russian Empire.

In 1828, by a ukase of the Tsar Nicolas I., a theological College was established at Polotsk, for the Uniat Dioceses of Western Russia and Lithuania, and placed under their Metropolitan, Josaphat Bulgak, with the same jurisdiction over the Greco-Uniats as the Holy Synod possessed over the Orthodox Church. In the Uniat Dioceses, Cathedral Chapters, Consistories, seminaries, and primary schools were established, and ample means for the maintenance of their clergy were granted by the State.

By such means the Uniats in a few years returned to their first principles; they freely acknowledge that several changes had been effected by the Uniat clergy set over

them, and a number of innovations had crept into their community. On the death of the Metropolitan Josaphat, Joseph Siemasko, bishop of Lithuania, was appointed to succeed him in the headship of the Uniat College, which, on January 1, 1838, was placed under Count Pratasof, Procurator of the Holy Synod [e].

During the Week of Orthodoxy, in February, 1839, all the Greco-Uniat bishops, together with their principal clergy, held a synod at Polotsk, at which the following petition was drawn up for presentation to the Tsar;—"By the wresting from Russia, in troublous times, of her Western provinces of Lithuania, and their annexation to Poland, the Russian Orthodox inhabitants were subjected to severe persecution through the unwearied efforts of the Polish government and the Court of Rome, to separate them from the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and to unite them to the Western. Persons of the highest station, their rights being in every way circumscribed, were forced to embrace the Roman faith, which was novel to them—citizen and peasant were alike forced from Communion with the Eastern Church by means of the Union which was introduced at the close of the sixteenth Century. From that time this people has been separated from its mother Russia—and the Uniats experienced in its full sense the bitterness of a foreign yoke.

These reasons, and more especially anxieties for the external welfare of the flock confided to us, urge us, firmly convinced of the truth of the sacred Apostolic doctrines of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, to fall at the feet of your Majesty—to permit them to be re-united

[e] The following account is mostly derived from Ustrialof's Nicolai I.

to their ancestral Orthodox Church of all the Russias. In assurance with our conjoint agreement on this subject, we have the happiness of presenting a Council-Act, composed by us the bishops and ruling clergy of the Greco-Uniat Church in the city of Polotsk, together with the autographical declaration of 1,305 persons of the Greco-Uniat clergy not present."

The Tsar instructed Count Pratasof to lay the Act and the Declaration before the Most Holy Synod. The Synod resolved to receive the bishops, priests, and all the flock of the Greco-Uniat Church into full and perfect Communion with the Holy Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, and to present the Emperor a most humble report on the subject.

On the Feast of the Annunciation, 1839, the report of the Synod received the ratification of the Tsar in these words; "I thank God and accept." After the ratification of the Tsar had been read in a full meeting of the Holy Synod on March 30, the Procurator introduced the Lithuanian bishop Joseph before the House. Seraphim, the Metropolitan of Petersburg and Novgorod, then announced the completion of the re-union; and Philaret, Metropolitan of Kief and Galich, read the synodal decree addressed to the re-united clergy. The title of the Greco-Uniat College was changed into that of the Lithuanian College of White Russia, Joseph being confirmed as its President, and at the same time raised to the rank of an Archbishop.

Thus the Uniats were re-united with the Orthodox Church. And since they had all along been in doctrine and ritual one with the Orthodox Church; and, on their union with Rome, the only point insisted on was the recognition of the Pope's supremacy; so now the only

profession required of them was; "Our Lord Jesus Christ is the one true Head of the one true Church." The reigning Pope, Gregory XVI. (1831—1836) issued an ineffectual allocution against the re-union; but public sentiment saw in it a case of historical justice.

We have related the proceedings at considerable length, in order to convey some idea of the cruel injustice to which the Orthodox Church was subjected, when Poland was at the height of its power; when its throne had become elective; and it had elected a Jesuit King to rule over it. The Jesuits have not been successful in their contentions with Orthodoxy. In 1860 they endeavoured to establish a Uniat Church in Bulgaria, and in 1861 the Pope consecrated Sokolskias, Archbishop; in August of the latter year he returned to the Orthodox Church. At the beginning of 1875, 50,000 Uniats from forty-five parishes in the diocese of Seidlitz in Poland, with twenty-six priests, disagreeing with the late Vatican decree, seceded from Rome, and were admitted into the Orthodox Church by the Archbishop of Warsaw. And later on in the same year, fifty-one parishes at Zamoscié gave in their adherence to the Orthodox Church; and a Uniat priest was consecrated Orthodox bishop of Lublin.

In the last century the dismemberment of Turkey and the liberation of Christian nations was continuous. In 1801 Georgia was annexed to Russia. We must make a digression in order to give an account of this interesting Church, venerable, as being, with Armenia, probably the oldest Church in Christendom; and because, through long centuries of oppression, it had never deviated from the Orthodox Church, even in ceremonial.

Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret somewhat differ in

the history of the Georgian Church[f]. According to Georgian writers Hebrews settled in Iberia (Georgia) before the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Amongst the soldiers who parted Christ's garments among them was a young Hebrew, to whose lot fell the seamless robe, and who took it with him to Iberia; (hence the emblazonment of the robe on the arms of Georgia). Tradition assigns the effectual preaching of the Gospel in Iberia to St. Andrew and Simon the Canaanite, the tomb of the latter being still shown in the country. The seamless robe, it may be mentioned, was bestowed on Russia during the Patriarchate of the great Philaret, by whom it was placed in the Cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin.

After the preaching of the two Apostles, the tradition continues, Christianity never died out; but it was more effectually established by St. Nina, a relative of the patron Saint, St. George, who decided on preaching the Gospel in Iberia, as being the country hallowed by the seamless robe.

Arrived at the capital of Iberia, Nina, through the conversion of the Queen, whom she had cured of a dangerous malady, drew upon herself the wrath of King Mirian; till he himself, having been struck blind whilst hunting, vowed to the God of Nina that, if he recovered his sight, he would "set up the wood of the Cross, and build a house of prayer, and become obedient to the faith of Nina." His sight being immediately restored, he renounced idolatry, and, together with his whole household and the inhabitants of the capital, was baptized by Nina into the Greek Church. He then sent, A.D. 318, to Constantine the Great for a bishop and presbyters, who were

[f] This account is grounded on Rev. S. C. Malan's translation.

accordingly despatched, bearing with them relics of our Lord's Passion and holy images ; and by them the whole nation was converted, and their Church was at first placed under the Patriarch of Antioch, but afterwards became autocephalous.

The Georgian Church was represented at Vagarshabad [g] by its Catholicos and a large number of bishops, but, unlike Armenia, it remained faithful to the Orthodox Church. In 1783 it abolished the office of its Catholicos, and placed itself under the Holy Synod of Russia. Georgia having for centuries sought the aid of Russia against the cruelties of the Shahs and Sultans, its King George XIII. in 1800 implored the Tsar Paul to take the Kingdom under his protection ; and in 1801 Georgia was annexed to Russia by Alexander I. The Tsar was offered as a gift the Cross of St. Nina, which she had received from the hands of the Virgin Mary ; he sent it back to Georgia, as a relic for the Georgian Church, and it is now preserved in the Cathedral of Tiflis by the side of St. Nina's image [h].

We can only briefly touch on the losses of Turkey in the last century, inasmuch as they belong primarily to secular history, and only affect ecclesiastical history so far that Turkey's loss is a gain to the Greek Church.

Of the Slavic States, Servia, once the Principality of St. Stephen Dushan, which since Kossova had undergone several vicissitudes, and had been lately suffering cruelties inflicted on it by the Janissaries and Pashas, was the first to win back its independence. The head of the Servian Church laid claim to the title of Patriarch.

[g] See p. 226.

[h] The evangelizer of Georgia is honoured on Dec. 15 as St. Chretienne. Theodoret, in P.N.F. I. 21 n.

He was present, as we have seen, at the synod of Moscow in 1655. He started for Moscow, we are told [i], in great glory and magnificence, with led horses having splendid saddles, silver harness and armour, and flowing bridles; he was, however, told that a sixth Patriarch was impossible, and was not allowed to enter the city till he had written an apology to Nicon, craving pardon for his presumption.

When the Servians enlisted the sympathy of Russia, and the Tsar, Alexander I., insisted on the rights given him by the Treaty of Kainardji, the Sultan, Selim III., received the claim with tears of humiliation and anger; it would be better, he said, to be buried under the ruins of Constantinople, than be bound by a treaty which would annihilate the Ottoman Empire.

The insurrection in Servia broke out in 1801. In the Treaty of Bucharest in 1812, an article was inserted for the independence of Servia, on the payment of tribute to the Porte; in 1813, Servia was reconquered by the Turks, with all the ensuing horrors usually resorted to by the Turks, after the suppression of an insurrection. Again the people flew to arms; and the independence of Servia as a separate State was recognized by the Sultan, Mahmoud II., at the Convention of Akerman in 1826, and confirmed by the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829.

In 1826, Murad disbanded the Janissaries, who had long shown a rebellious spirit; and the malady of "the sick man," thus deprived of his best troops, entered on a new stage.

Whilst the war with Servia was going on, and Turkey

[i] *Travels of Macarius.*

was engaged in another war with Ali Pasha of Joannina, the War of Greek Independence broke out. Ever since the Fall of Constantinople, Greece as a nation had ceased to exist, and the glorious name of Hellenes was swamped in that of Romans. Into the vexed question whether a large portion of the inhabitants of Greece are not Slavs, it is not our province to enter; according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the Peloponnesus was in the eighth century Slavonized; and the change of the Greek name Peloponnesus into Morea certainly seems to argue a Slavonic original.

Greece had all along remained firmly adhered to the Orthodox Church, and the Church fanned into life the national sentiment of the Greeks, that they were Hellenes, the family of the Greek Emperors. The Greeks relied upon material assistance from Russia; but the interest which the Tsar Alexander took in the struggle was ecclesiastical not political; he sympathised with Greek Orthodoxy, but that did not seem to him to imply Greek nationality. On political grounds the independence of Greece was not consonant with the ideas of the Tsar; the time might come when Pan-Slavism and Pan-Hellenism might clash, and conflicts between Russian and Greek interests arise on the Bosphorus. As a member also of the Holy Alliance he was opposed to revolutionary principles.

The crisis was precipitated by the cruel murder on Easter Day, April 22, 1821, of the Patriarch Gregory, who, on the false charge of being an accomplice of the Philike Hetæria (a secret Society which fostered the Revolution), was arrested at the Altar, and being offered, at the foot of the scaffold, honours, if he would turn Mahometan, hung in his pontifical robes before his

palace at Constantinople ; his body, after hanging three days, being delivered by the Vizier to a Jewish rabble, who dragged it through the streets, and then threw it, heavily weighted with stones, into the Bosphorus, hoping to deprive it of Christian burial. The body was seen to approach, by some wonderful means, a Russian vessel ; the crew of which took it on board and conveyed it to Odessa, where it remained, a highly valued possession, for fifty years. On the fiftieth anniversary, his Greek compatriots obtained the permission of the Russian Government to remove it to Athens, where Lycurgus, Archbishop of the Cyclades, so well-known in England, delivered a splendid address over his coffin [k].

The cruel murder was followed by others, of about twenty Metropolitans and bishops.

The first movements of the revolution occurred in 1821; and in that year the Tsar sent an ultimatum to Turkey, demanding that a stop should be put to these savage cruelties. Till George Canning took office in 1822, the British Government, says Mr. Gladstone, "viewed the rebellion with an evil eye, from jealousy to Russia." In England the cause of the Greeks found many sympathizers, amongst whom the name of Lord Byron is conspicuous. Especially dear to Greeks is the name of Byron, whose advocacy of their cause was cut short by his death at Mesolonghi in 1824 ; but dear beyond all is the name of George Canning.

In December, 1825, the Tsar Alexander died, sorely perplexed between his duty to Orthodoxy and his conservative sentiments, his last days being embittered by the knowledge that he was marked out for assassination.

[k] *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1876.

The Holy Alliance came to an end; the new Tsar, Nicolas I., determined to enforce the protectorate of the Christians given him by the Treaty of Kainardji, presented, in March, 1826, an ultimatum, insisting on the execution of the Treaty of Bucharest. This led to the Convention of Akerman on October 8, 1826;—"to arrange the mode of executing the Treaty of Bucharest, which had not been executed by the Porte since 1821—and to carry out the privileges which Moldavia, Wallachia, and Servia ought to enjoy under the protection of Russia."

In April, 1827, Capo d'Istrias, a native of Corfu, was elected for seven years President of the National Assembly at Nauplia. In the same month, George Canning became Prime Minister. In July, by the Treaty of London, Greek Independence, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, and by payment of an annual tribute, was acknowledged. On August 8, George Canning died. On October 20 was fought the Battle of Navarino (the ancient Pylos), in which the Turkish and Egyptian fleets were destroyed.

The political independence of Greece was incompatible with ecclesiastical dependence on the Patriarch of Constantinople, the subject of the Sultan with whom Greece had been at war. His name was therefore omitted by the Church; and when the Patriarch remonstrated, Capo d'Istrias informed him that the murder of Gregory and the other bishops rendered the return of Greece to its former allegiance impossible.

By the Treaty of Adrianople in September, 1829 (though Moldavia and Wallachia were left under the suzerainty of the Porte, with a promise of the free exercise of their religion), with regard to Servia, the

Convention of Akerman was to be observed, and by Article X. the Treaty of London to be carried out.

Greece was now free, and by a Protocol signed in February, 1830, the suzerainty of the Porte was abolished. In February, 1832, the throne was conferred on Prince Otho of Bavaria, a youth seventeen years of age, and a Roman Catholic, who, in 1836, married a Protestant, Amalia, daughter of the Grand Duke of Oldenburg.

A National Synod of the Kingdom of Greece (*ἱερὰ σύνοδος τῆς Βασιλίδος τῆς Ἑλλάδος*), in 1833, passed a resolution to the effect that the Orthodox and Apostolic Church of Greece, whilst it preserves dogmatic unity with the Eastern Orthodox Churches, is dependent on no external authority; and spiritually owns no head but the Founder of the Christian faith (*τὸν Θεμελιωτὴν τῆς Χριστιάνης Πίστεως*). In the external government (*κατὰ τὸ διοικητικὸν μέρος*), which belongs to the Crown, she acknowledges the King of Greece as her supreme head, as not being opposed to the canons. The Sacred Synod, wholly composed of prelates appointed by the King, was to be its highest ecclesiastical authority; and a royal delegate was to attend its sittings, who, though without a vote, should countersign all its decisions, without which they should be void.

The Patriarch of Constantinople ignored the independence of the Synod, and two parties arose, one (the more numerous) claiming entire independence of, the other a closer union with, the Œcumenical Patriarch. This continued till 1852, when an agreement was arrived at, the Patriarch Anthimus recognizing the rights of the Synod in home affairs, but reserving to himself the right of interposing in affairs affecting the Church at large.

Through a revolution in 1862, Otho was deposed, and

a Lutheran King, Prince George of Denmark, elected in 1863; who, in 1867, married an Orthodox wife, Olga, daughter of the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia. By the constitution granted in 1864 it was enacted;—Article I.: The established religion of Greece is that of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Article II.: The Orthodox Church of Greece, "acknowledging for its Head the Lord Jesus Christ, is indissolubly united in doctrine with the great Church of Constantinople, and with every other Church holding the same doctrines; observing, as they invariably do, the holy Apostolic and synodical canons, and holy traditions."

In 1815, the Ionian Islands were placed under the protectorate of England. When the revolution of 1862 broke out, the British Government promised the provisional government of Greece that, if the King elected met its approval, the Islands would be transferred to the Kingdom of Greece; this was accordingly done by a treaty, signed by the five great powers, in November, 1863, one of the conditions of which was that King George's successors should be members of the Orthodox Greek Church.

In 1870, Alexander Lycurgus, the learned Archbishop of the Cyclades, paid a memorable visit of nearly three months to England, and returned to Greece with a keen desire for the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches. The primary object of his visit was the consecration of the Orthodox Church at Liverpool, where he showed the catholicity of his spirit by attending an Anglican Church and giving the blessing. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who was too unwell to entertain him, greeted his arrival with a letter; the Archbishop of York entertained him at his palace. He was the guest of Mr.

Gladstone, of the bishops of Winchester, Ely, and the "philhellenic bishop" of Lincoln, Dr. Wordsworth, who recited in Greek the Nicene Creed in his private chapel, with the omission of the Filioque. He visited the present Prime Minister, and had an audience of the late Queen. At Oxford he was the guest of the President of Magdalen, and received the degree of D.D., and of D.C.L. at Cambridge. We might mention other instances of good-will, meant to honour the Greek Church through their valued representative; suffice it to say that, having been personally present at the Anglican Eucharist, and having discussed the Filioque with the Bishop of Lincoln and Dr. Pusey, before his departure he wrote to Archbishop Tait: "I am now departing for Constantinople, and will there announce, by word of mouth and by letter, to our most Holy and Œcumenical Patriarch, and to all the august Patriarchs of the East, and above all, to the most Blessed Patriarch of Jerusalem, my own spiritual Father,—the many things pleasing and acceptable to God, which I have seen and heard in this country. And for the time to come I will never shrink from labouring to the uttermost to bring about the harmony of the Churches." On his return to Greece he presented to the Holy Synod a hopeful Report in the cause of union; and Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, the head of the Greek, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the Anglican, Church, that Lycurgos had told him of "the ardent and lofty reverence" of the Anglican towards "the Holy and Orthodox Eastern Church. These things straighten, smooth, and prepare beforehand the ways and paths of the spiritual unity of the faithful everywhere."

Since the agreement in 1852, a desire for a closer union

with the Patriarchate has arisen on political grounds, a jealousy between Pan-Slavism and Pan-Hellenism, which culminated in the recent riots at Athens.

Rightly or wrongly the Greeks foster a desire of reviving the Greek Empire, which is strongly opposed by Russia, who, whilst denying that it wants Constantinople for itself, will allow none but its present occupiers to possess it. The immediate cause of the recent riots was the translation of the Gospels into a patois, understood and spoken by the people, to whom the Hellenistic form is unintelligible. This the students of the University resented, not only as a degradation of the ancient Greek, but as a movement which they ascribed to Russian intrigue, a desire on the part of Russia to exterminate the Greek element, and with it all hope of reviving a Greek Empire. The Students demanded from the Metropolitan the excommunication of the translators, and the burning of their works; and not till the King accepted the resignation of the Metropolitan, and of the cabinet, and several high officials, were the riots quelled and peace restored.

There is evidently little good-will between the Kingdom of Greece and the huge colossus which bestrides Europe and Asia; and from their differences no one will profit except the Turk.

By the Treaty of Paris in February, 1856, Russia was deprived of the protectorate of the Greek Church; nothing was put in its place; and the Eastern Christians were left to the mercy and promises of the Sultan, which he could not carry out even if he wished. The Turk was admitted into the council of European nations; and "the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire" were guaranteed.

By the Treaty of Kainardji a distinct right to interfere on behalf of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia was accorded to Russia; the right was confirmed by four Firmans, in 1775, 1783, 1792, and 1802. By the treaty of 1856 their independence was decreed, as two separate Principalities; but since 1866 they have been under the same government, as the united Roumania.

What is known as the Eastern question was re-opened in 1875 by an insurrection in the Slavic Province of Herzegovina, to which was added another, a few weeks later, in the adjacent Province of Bosnia. In June, 1876, intelligence reached England of terrible massacres in Bulgaria, which excited the greatest horror and indignation, and led the English Foreign Secretary, Lord Derby, to assert that, if Russia declared war against Turkey, "it would be practically impossible to interfere on behalf of the Ottoman Empire."

Sympathy with their co-religionists induced Servia and Montenegro, simultaneously, to proclaim war against Turkey; and in July the Archbishop of Belgrade wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, inclosing a letter from leading inhabitants of Bosnia and Herzegovina, setting forth their dreadful oppression, and appealing to the Christian feeling of the English. It was the old story, so horrible and disgusting, that we cannot commit it to these pages.

Peaceful measures being exhausted, Russia, on April 24, 1877, formally declared war against Turkey; and in May, Roumania announced its independence, and made common action with its co-religionists of the Greek Church.

The war ended in January, 1878, in the complete defeat of Turkey, who, having rejected the advice of the Powers, had killed the arrangement of 1856. On March 3

the Treaty of San Stephano was signed, which Lord Salisbury, who became Foreign Secretary on the resignation of Lord Derby, declared, by establishing the predominance of Russia, was in contravention of the Treaty of Paris[1]; and a fresh Congress was arranged to meet at Berlin in June.

On June 4 the English Government received from the Sultan the Island of Cyprus; England guaranteeing the protection of the Sultan's dominions in Asia; the Sultan promising to make reforms, and to protect the Armenians from the Kurds and Circassians. How utterly Turkey has disregarded her part of the compact, the Armenian massacres of 1894 are evidence.

The autocephalous Church of Cyprus being subject to British rule, *The Cyprus Society* was formed, for assisting the Orthodox bishops in the education of their clergy; and the resident Anglican Chaplain, Rev. F. Spencer, was appointed H.M. Inspector of both the Christian and Mahometan Schools. On the Society coming to an end, the E.C.A. deputed the Rev. F. E. Brightman, of the Pusey House, Oxford, to proceed to Cyprus; and, agreeably to his Report, the Rev. T. F. Duckworth was, in 1895, appointed as assistant for two years to Mr. Spencer. Amongst the instructions given him, one was that he should uphold the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Cyprus, and the Metropolitan of the Island; and another to cultivate friendly intercourse with the clergy and laity of the Eastern Church.

The Treaty of Berlin, signed on July 3, 1878, modified the Treaty of San Stephano. Bosnia and Herzegovina were placed under the protectorate of Austria; Monte-

[1] Lord Salisbury, now Prime Minister, has since declared that, in the Crimean War, England "put its money on the wrong horse."

negro was enlarged; Bulgaria was divided into two Provinces, separated by the Balkans; but, in 1885, Eastern Roumelia was by its own population annexed to Bulgaria.

In 1881 the Ambassadors at Constantinople extorted from the Sultan almost the whole of Thessaly and the command of the Gulf of Arta, for Greece; but Turkey refused to abandon Epirus.

The latest event to be recorded in the recovery of the Greek Church, is the withdrawal of the Turks from Crete, in 1898. Servia, Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Eastern Roumelia and Crete, have been now withdrawn from the Turkish Empire.

One little strip of Slavic territory, much coveted by the Turks and Austria, Montenegro (*black mountain*), or as the people themselves call it, Czernagora, with its capital Cettinge, the smallest Metropolis in the world, has always maintained its independence and Orthodoxy. After the disaster of Kossova, the Montenegrin Ruler safely retired, to offer an asylum to the exile Servians; and under its hereditary Vladikas, or Prince-bishops, Montenegro has ever since bid defiance to the Turks. The Vladika, if not already ordained, was compelled to receive orders from the Orthodox Metropolitan of Carlowitz; but when, in the nineteenth century, the country was brought into closer connection with Russia, from the Metropolitan of Moscow. The Patron Saint of Montenegro, Vladika Peter II., died on St. Luke's day, 1851, after a reign of fifty-three years; having appointed his nephew Daniel his successor. The two offices of Prince and Bishop were then divided, Daniel only holding the secular office.

CONCLUSION.

The Reunion of Christendom.

"The most serious misfortune," writes a well-known Russian General[a], "that has befallen the Christian world since the beginning of our era, is undoubtedly the great schism between Rome, on the one hand, and Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, on the other; and no greater blessing can be conceived than the reconciliation of these Churches after their long separation."

It is a melancholy reflexion that, whilst combination and union are everywhere else the rule, the Christian Church is as divided now as it was 848 years ago. "Every kingdom divided against itself," our Saviour tells us, "is brought to desolation." Union would give the Church the strength derived from solidarity, and the opportunity of wholly directing its energies to the benefit of mankind; whereas the weakness of disunion hampers the Church, and is the great hindrance not only to making Christians of one mind at home, but to bringing the non-Orthodox Churches of the East back to the Orthodox Church, and to spreading the Gospel in heathen countries.

It has from the first been the function of the Church to satisfy the various ages of the world, and the different temperaments of mankind; so that catholic union is compatible with a large diversity of religious thought; such, for instance, as we have in England. There may be unity without uniformity; and it is probable that

[a] Kiréef, *Correspondence on Papal Infallibility.*

from the beginning there have been what in the present day are called high and low Church people. The strong link combining three schools of thought in the Church of England is the Book of Common Prayer; different organizations, and diversity of ritual, are signs of life, and prevent spiritual stagnation; the width and depth of the spirituality which exists in England are implied in the idea of a National Church.

A celebrated ultramontane, Count Le Maistre, who was far from well disposed towards the Church of England, stated his opinion;—"Si jamais les Chrétiens se rapprochent, comme tout les y invite, il semble que la motion doit partir de l'Église de l'Angleterre." The Nationality of the English Church is an important factor in dealing with the Eastern and Russian Churches. "No Church," said the late Dr. Döllinger, whom Count Montalembert styled "unquestionably the first man in the Church of Germany," "is so national, so deeply rooted in popular affection, so bound up in the institutions of the country" (as the English); "the cold indifferentism which, on the Continent, spreads like a deadly mildew, knows no place in the British Isles."

People talk of "our unhappy divisions;" but we of the Church of England are not so divided, but that one and all are desirous of the fulfilment of our Redeemer's dying prayer for His Church, that "they may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou has sent Me."

The Reunion of Christendom has of late years been brought prominently forward.

In 1857 a society was formed under the title of "The Association for Promoting the Unity of Christendom;"

its object being "to unite in a bond of intercessory prayer members, both of the clergy and laity, of the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Anglican Communities." Rome naturally opposed the movement; for, whilst she is conscious that union with her is at present impossible, she dreads a rapprochement between the Greek and Anglican Churches, as calculated to give the death-blow to her pretensions.

That our bishops are not insensible of their duty in this respect, was shown at the last Lambeth Conference; it was there said: "We believe that we have been providentially intrusted with our part of the Catholic and Apostolic inheritance bequeathed by our Lord;" and then they allude to the *dictum* of Le Maistre; "an eminent Roman Catholic, Count Le Maistre, declared his conviction that the English Church was endowed with a quality analogous to that possessed by chemical intermedes, of combining irreconcilable substances."

The Reunion of Christendom, without the inclusion of Protestant Nonconformists, would of course be incomplete; and it has been justly said that reunion ought to begin at home. There exists amongst us a "Home Reunion Society," having the object of bringing Nonconformists into the National Church, which is willing to support any scheme, which does not compromise the three Creeds, nor the historic Episcopate.

The subject engaged the attention of the same Lambeth Conference. "Controversy in the past," it said, "has been too much the grave of charity. We confess that the time has now arrived, in which the constituted authorities of the various branches of our Communion should make it known, that they hold themselves in readiness to enter into brotherly conference with representatives of other

Christian communities of the English-speaking races."—The Conference, however, felt "bound to express our conviction as to the magnitude and difficulty which lies before us."

With a view to reunion with historically Catholic Churches, the Anglican, being a Western Church, would naturally first turn to her Western sister; but Rome, in that respect, is at present a negligable quantity. Papal supremacy is the only sense in which a Pope views reunion, and that, and unconditional surrender, are the only terms which he would accept. The *Ecclesia Anglicana*, (the original Church of the land), appeals to history; the Roman Church ignores history, or rather interprets history by Romanism, instead of Romanism by history; and even distorts the plainest facts revealed to us in the Bible. Roman Catholics, for instance, allow that St. Paul rebuked Peter "because he was to be blamed;" but, since that does not fit in with Papal Infallibility, a Roman Catholic writer, in a work dedicated to, and approved by, the late Pope, seriously maintains that it was not the Apostle Peter, but some one bearing the same name[b]. There are some four hundred Acts or Canons of Councils, during the first five centuries, in which the prerogatives of the see of Rome are never mentioned, or, if mentioned, it is simply to be disclaimed. The Liturgy of St. James, probably the oldest document in the world, put forth by the Church of Jerusalem, does not ascribe to St. Peter the foundation of the Church; but speaks of, "Thy Holy Church, which Thou hast founded on the Rock of faith, so that the gates of hell may not prevail against it."

[b] See letter on "Infallibility and Reunion," in *Guardian*, May 14, 1902.

The Roman Church uses empty assertions in the place of proof; and bases its highest pretensions on fabrications, which existed from an early date, but chief amongst which were the *Forged Decretals.* Consequently Rome is always on the defensive. Pope Honorius was anathematized by Pope after Pope, by Council after Council; yet volumes have been written in his defence, which convince no one except a Roman Catholic. It also stultifies the decrees of Popes; it reiterates Baptism, whereas the third Article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. decrees, that "Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be reiterated without sacrilege."

The Greek and Anglican Churches received a severe shock, through the publication of the dogma of Papal Infallibility, formulated at the Vatican Council, on July 18, 1870. That council, which the Greek Church declined to attend, and to which the Anglican Church, including its branches of America and Canada, and numbering between 200 and 300 bishops, was not invited—a council which Mgr. Darboy, the martyr-Archbishop of Paris, styled a synod of churchwardens—decreed that Papal decisions are *of themselves*, and *without the consent of the Church*, irreformable, thus placing the greatest barrier since the time of Michael Cerularius in the way of reunion.

The dogma was passed by 451 *placets*, a number which, even supposing that a majority were not dragooned into agreement, was insignificant enough. But how were the votes obtained? This was exposed in a Memorial issued, in September, 1870, by the Catholic Professors of Nuremberg. In spite of the Bishops, an order of business was imposed by the Pope, which hampered their freedom; a moral pressure was exercised through various means

at the command of the Pope; and free expression was prevented by the premature closing of the Council.

As to the composition of the Council, we quote a letter written from Rome at the time[c]. "Of the 451 *placets* a very considerable portion consisted of bishops *in partibus*, who have no cures, and of whom there are 120; of Oriental Bishops and Patriarchs, numbering 57, many of whom are trembling, lest they should be deprived of their ancient privileges, and hope, by their subservience, to avert the threatened calamity; of Abbots and members of religious orders, who amount to 51, and whose policy history has always shown to be invariably hostile to the episcopal order; and lastly, of 143 prelates from the Pontifical State alone; giving a total of 371, and leaving a balance on the side of the majority of 66. To whom may be added a proportion (the majority claim almost all) of those 62 who voted *juxta modum*. Grant that the majority are correct in this assertion, and add 50 of these votes to 66, we have, as the result, that the opinions of 116 independent bishops have been imposed upon the opposition of 88, as to whose integrity and independence there can be no question; and amongst whom are found the most learned men of their order, the pastors of infinitely the most numerous and intelligent members of the Roman Catholic faith." Of these the most learned probably was Dr. Döllinger, who wrote: "'not a single person believes in it,' is what I hear day by day from all lips."

In 1826 thirty Irish bishops of the Roman Church signed a declaration that "it is not an article of the

[c] *Times*, July 23, 1870.

Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible." As the dogma of Infallibility has been adduced at second hand, and a wrong construction placed upon it, it may be advisable to give it in full;—"Docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus, Romanum Pontificem, cum ex cathedrâ loquitur, i.e. cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro supremâ suâ Apostolicâ auctoritate, doctrinam de fide vel moribus, ab universâ Ecclesiâ tenendam, definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, eâ infallibilitate pollere quâ divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definiendâ doctrinâ de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit, ideoque ejus modi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiæ, irreformabiles esse."

A Nemesis seemed to follow the dogma; two months afterwards the Patrimony of Peter came to an end, and the joyful cry of Viva il Rè resounded in the streets of Rome. The English offered the Pope Malta as a residence; but he knew that Valetta had not the prestige of Rome, which was necessary to keep his consenting, but unconvinced, bishops together.

"There is a wide gap," wrote the late Professor Freeman[d], "between the Papacy before, and since, 1870. Rome's temporal dominion is gone; she herself has a local King set over her; she herself is practically without her spiritual head, when the high altar at the Lateran, the Patriarchal Church of Western Christendom, reserved for the Pope alone, has stood for thirty years useless, the Pope regarding himself as a prisoner in a distant part of the City."

[d] Essays, Third Series, p. 19.

The dogma is capable of the plainest historical disproofs, which also render it ridiculous. Popes Zosimus, Vigilius, and Honorius fell into heresy, in their *ex cathedrâ* utterances; but it was not heresy in them, because they were infallible in doctrine. Octavian, grandson of the disreputable Marozia, the daughter of the Papal paramour, Theodora, becomes, in 956, Pope John XII., at the age of nineteen; we have it on responsible authority, that from that moment he was infallible in doctrine; in him iniquity reached its climax, and he was deposed by the Cardinals; yet we have it on the same authority that, as Pope, he was infallible in morals. Benedict IX. was, in 1033, taken, almost from his nursery, to be made Pope at the age of twelve; he proved to be one of the most profligate of the many profligate Popes, and was deposed at the council of Sutri in 1046.

The dogma is disproved by the plainest historical facts. We will content ourselves with three instances. "The divine Meletius," as Theodoret calls him, was the first President at the second Œcumenical Council, when he was under the excommunication of the Pope. In this case we are asked to reject cotemporaneous writers, and to accept the twentieth-century history of Rome; and are told that he could not have been under the excommunication of Rome, or he would not have been allowed to preside.

St. Hilary of Arles (429—449) died out of Communion with Rome.

When Cæsarini left the Council of Basle for the Pope's Council at Ferrara, his place was taken by the Cardinal Archbishop of Arles, whom the Pope, in consequence, excommunicated; he remained Archbishop; and such was the sanctity in which he was held, that, after his

death, in 1450, miracles were believed to be performed at his tomb; and in 1527 he was canonized by a Bull of Pope Clement VII.

Even in the Forged Decretals, the late Cardinal Manning found a justification for the Papal claims; they could not, he argued, have "deceived any one if they had not closely corresponded with the facts before the eyes of men[e]." "For three centuries past," writes the author of *The Pope and the Council*, "the forgery has been exposed; yet the principles it introduced and brought into practice, have taken deep root in the soil of the Church; and have so grown into her life, that the exposure of the fraud has produced no result, in shaking the dominant system."

But the Cardinal proves too much. The Forged Decretals were used by the Popes to their own advantage, in their contests for supremacy with the Patriarchs of Constantinople. The Roman Church is thus hung on the horns of a dilemma. Either the Popes used them as true, knowing them to be false; (and in this respect it is difficult to acquit Pope Nicolas I., for he asserted that they were preserved in the Roman archives;) or they believed them to be true; what then becomes of Papal Infallibility[f]?

Not only has Rome condemned Anglican Orders, but also the whole ecclesiastical system of the Greek Church.

In 1896 the present Pope appointed a committee, to report on the validity of Anglican Orders. Bearing in mind the case of the Uniats, there is little reason to

[e] *Tablet*, April 16, 1886.

[f] The writer would refer to p. 184 of this work; it is evident from the letters of Gregory the Great that even the Western bishops did not consider him infallible.

doubt that, if England would recognize his supremacy, the Pope would recognize English Orders. It would be a difficult thing to do, for it would expose the schismatical character of the Roman hierarchy in England; but the gain of England to Rome would be a set-off against the gain of Russia by the Greek Church. The report was unfavourable, as every one must have known from the first that it would be; and the Pope issued two documents, an Encyclical *Satis Cognitum*, and the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, declaring them to be "null" and "invalid." This Bull the two English Archbishops figuratively tore in pieces. On the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, 1898, Cardinal Vaughan put forth *A Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ*, which the Archbishops answered, on March 12, in *The Anglican Archbishops' Reply*. The Cardinal, in the expectation that they would agree with him, sent the documents to the Russian bishops, with the result that two Russian Professors examined the matter, and pronounced our Orders, on historical and canonical grounds, valid.

In 1231 the Archbishop of Bari in Apulia represented to Pope Gregory IX. certain practices of Greeks in his Province; their baptizing in the third person; their ordaining persons so baptized; their confirming with chrism administered by a Priest. The Pope condemned the Greek practices in every instance; he decreed that persons "taliter baptizati" should be re-baptized in the first person, and then re-admitted "ad majores et minores ordines." Thus he condemned all Greek Orders, and the Sacraments which depend on those Orders. Pope Gregory IX., it will be remembered, was the Pope that thrice excommunicated the great Emperor Frederic II., and drew upon himself a rebuke from St. Louis of France:

eventually he sunk under disasters, public and private, which his own violence had created.

From the Roman we turn to the Greek Church. The reunion of Christendom, without Rome being included, is of course a figure of speech, analogous to the union of the British Isles without England; still in the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches lie possibilities of the spread of the Christian faith, which it is impossible to calculate; and if the Greek and Anglican Churches were united, Rome would soon be forced to seek admission into the alliance.

Till recent years the very existence of the Greek Church (except as confined to Russia) was unknown to, and in the present day is misunderstood by, many persons in England. To those who love antiquity for its own sake, its antiquity alone, apart from its being the Church of the land hallowed by the sacred memories of our Saviour, is enough to recommend it. What it has done for Christianity was summed up in an address presented to Archbishop Lycurgus, at the consecration, in 1870, of the Greek Church of St. Nicolas at Liverpool; a ceremony at which the then Archbishop of York expressed his regret, that a severe domestic affliction prevented his being present. "The Church which you represent," it said, "was the cradle of the Christian religion. Bethlehem and Calvary remind us of our common Redeemer—our one Head. From the Eastern Church of nineteen centuries ago, we Christians obtain our faith; from its Apostles we derive our succession; its Liturgies supplied our Liturgy; its Creeds are our daily confession of faith; to its Fathers we defer. In its glory of having the imperishable name of Christian, bestowed at Antioch, and of having St. James, our Lord's brother, martyred

at Jerusalem, we trace our heritage of title, confessorship, and blessing."

For long centuries the Church of SS. Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, and Chrysostom; the Church which has the same Liturgies; follows the same doctrines and discipline; uses the same prayers; sings the same hymns as they did; the Church which once numbered 800 bishops, has lived on under the grinding oppression of its successive conquerors, Arabs, Mongols, Turks. No wonder that it sunk low; the wonder is that, under cruel persecution and every temptation to apostatize[g], it so nobly struggled on, now to rise again on the ashes of its former self, to take its rightful place, as in the days of the great Councils, in the affairs of Christendom.

"The Greek rite," says the late Rev. W. Palmer, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, who, at the time that he became a convert to Rome, assured the Rev. Father who admitted him, that he agreed with the Greek, rather than with the Roman, Church[h], "is like a plant which, though covered with dust and somewhat withered, has preserved its original shape and proportions; whereas the Latin is so changed, that it is like a new building, constructed in part out of the ruins of the old."

The *Guardian* in November, 1901, under the heading

[g] In 1843 a young Armenian, who had embraced Mahometanism and afterwards returned to his original faith, was, notwithstanding the remonstrances of the English ambassador, publicly executed in the streets of Constantinople. His martyrdom was the cause, through the intervention of the Christian Powers, of the execution of converts from Mahometanism being stopped.

[h] The writer is far from imputing general laxity in this respect (which he knows is not the case) to the Roman Church; he adduces a statement made by Mr. Palmer himself.

"The Orthodox Patriarchate and the Church of England," contained in full a translation of an interesting and suggestive document, issued in September of that year, from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, with the approval of the Patriarch[i]. That important organ of the Church of England comments on the document, as being one of the many tokens which reach us from the East, testifying to the "sincerely fraternal spirit" which animates the clergy and laity of the Greek towards the members of the Anglican Church. Not only does the Greek Church recognize the validity of our Orders, but Greek prelates of the highest rank have repeatedly attended Anglican services, both here and in the East, and have pronounced the benediction at the conclusion; and the *Guardian* speaks of the regular correspondence, on all official and ceremonial occasions, which is firmly established between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Patriarch of Constantinople.

Schemes for reunion, treated politically at Lyons and Florence, served only to aggravate and intensify the schism; which went on widening more and more, till the fall of Constantinople, when it is a matter of history that the Greeks preferred enslavement to Turkey, to the spiritual thraldom of Rome. In the present day the movement has entered on an ecclesiastical stage, and is regarded with general favour by the Greek and Anglican Churches; each desiring to know more of the other, and each labouring, without the compromise of any principle, to smooth away difficulties which stand in the way of reunion.

Amongst the most important events in the history of

[i] The translation is, by the permission of the *Guardian*, given in Appendix B. of this work.

the post-Reformation Church, as being held at a time when an Œcumenical Council cannot be held, are the Conferences at Lambeth. Bishops of the Anglican Community from all parts of the world—Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australasia, Oceania—not merely titular bishops, but bishops presiding over Dioceses; meeting together under the Archbishop of Canterbury; exhibited such a noble instance of Christian unity, as carries us back to the best ages of Church history. They are Conferences, not Councils, and therefore their resolutions are not binding; as the old Catholic bishop, Herzog, who attended the third Conference, said; "They claim no infallibility, proclaim no dogmas, and utter no anathemas;" but their moral force cannot but be immense.

In his opening address, at the first Conference in 1867, the Archbishop of Canterbury commended as a subject, the best mode of promoting the unity of Christendom. The Introduction to the resolutions expressed deep sorrow for "the divided condition of the flock of Christ throughout the world;" and solemnly recorded its "conviction, that unity will be most effectually promoted, by maintaining the faith in its purity and integrity—as taught in the Holy Scriptures, held by the primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds, and affirmed in the undisputed General Councils."

The bishops assembled at the Lambeth Conference of 1878 recommended the observance of a season of prayer, for the unity of Christendom, on the Tuesday before Ascension Day (that being a Rogation Day), or any of the seven days after that Tuesday; and the bishop of London, as Dean of the Province of Canterbury, at the suggestion of the Archbishop, wrote to the bishops of the Province, and through them to the clergy of their

Dioceses, recommending that season for a united act of intercession for the unity of Christ's Church [k].

The third Conference (in 1888), spoke hopefully of reunion with the Greek Church, and put forth a reasonable minimum (equally suitable for Home Reunion), as a basis ; (1) the Bible ; (2) the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds ; (3) the two Sacraments ; (4) the historic Episcopate. With regard to the Eastern Church, "the hopeful belief" was expressed that "our differences were either matters of unauthorized individual opinion, or capable of explanation and adjustment."

The thirty-sixth Resolution of the fourth and last Conference, held in 1897 (the 1300th anniversary of the landing of St. Augustine), went still further. The two Archbishops and the Bishop of London were requested to act as a committee, for the purpose of conferring with "the Orthodox Eastern Patriarchs, the Holy Governing Synod of Russia, and the chief authorities of the various Eastern Churches ; with a view to considering the possibility of securing a clearer understanding and of establishing closer relations between the Churches of the East, and the Anglican Communion." This Resolution the Bishop of Salisbury was commissioned by the Archbishop to convey, during a visit he was about to make to the East, to the four Patriarchs, as well as to the Archbishop of Cyprus.

The bishop started on his journey at the commencement of 1898, and the welcome everywhere accorded him in the East, and not least, by Constantine V., Patriarch of Constantinople, was of the most fraternal

[k] In the present year (1902), May 10—18 was the season set apart for intercession ; the subject for Whitsunday (May 18) being "the reunion of Christendom." Leaflet of A.P.U.C.

character. The Patriarch wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking for explanation of certain passages in the resolution, such as "clearer understanding," "closer relation of the Churches." The Archbishop's answer was conveyed to the Patriarch by the Incumbent of Christ Church, Pera, who was returning from England, accompanied by an English mechanic, to erect the *Theodore Memorial Press* at Constantinople. The Archbishop explained that the desired intercourse must grow by degrees; he assured the Patriarch of the deep respect with which the Anglican Church regards the hierarchy of the Orthodox Eastern Church; and he mentioned the brotherly correspondence, which had existed for ages between the two Churches. He suggested that there should be no proselytizing on either side; that whilst he himself would request the English chaplain at Constantinople to call upon the Patriarch, the Greek clergy in London should, on certain great festivals, call on him; and that the Patriarch should act conjointly with him in disseminating the Scriptures.

To this letter the Patriarch, after consultation with his synod, returned an answer of a very friendly and affectionate nature, and he sent a copy of the Archbishop's letter to the *Ekklesiastike Aletheia* at Constantinople.

Meanwhile, on July 16, 1899, the English Press, a memorial to Theodore, a Greek of Tarsus in Cilicia, Archbishop of Canterbury (669—690), was erected at the Phanar. The Patriarch wrote to Archbishop Temple, that, now that he had ample machinery, "it will not be long before the Word of God be distributed in many thousand copies among the Orthodox population which bears the name of Christ."

In a speech before Convocation on February 15, 1876, the Bishop of Gloucester asked, whether it was not inconsistent, whilst there were Protestant dissenters at home (he gave no reason why the two should not go on together), and whilst the Patriarch of Constantinople forbade the circulation of the Scriptures in modern Greek, to seek intercommunion with the Greek Church; the Lambeth Conferences answer the first, the Theodore Memorial Press, the second question.

The Patriarch added to his letter to the Archbishop;—"the end of all this is, beloved brother in Christ, that we grow in love one to another, and that our hearts, and those of the people and clergy under us, be more closely knit together." The Patriarch also wrote to the Bishop of Salisbury, that the Theodore Press would be "a constant and visible memorial, and a stimulus to draw closer the bonds of mutual brotherly understanding, which, by God's grace, are being renewed, and to persevere in our offorts after intercommunion;" and he spoke of "that Communion and union, which is suggested to us by God, and *is, it appears, sincerely desired on both sides.*"

Enough has been said to show that the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches is approaching the range of practical politics. A minimum basis was, as we have seen, adopted at the third Lambeth Conference; another was agreed on at the Old Catholic Conferences at Bonn, which owe their origin to the late Dr. Döllinger, Rector of the University of Munich.

The Old Catholic movement was organized by Roman Catholics, who refused their assent to Papal infallibility, in order to obtain the Sacraments which were, in consequence, denied them by the Vaticanists. They aban-

doned union with the Roman Catholic Church of the present, in order to preserve union with the Catholic Church of the past. They took their stand on history, and styled themselves *Old Catholics*, as holding the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, previously to 1870. In the programme which they issued it was stated, "We hope for reunion with the Greek, Oriental, and Russian Churches, the separation of which arose without any cogent reason—as well as with the episcopal Churches of England and America."

The Old Catholic Conferences at Bonn have done an important service, by bringing together the Greek and Anglican Churches; by representing the Anglican Church in a different light to that in which it had been misrepresented to the Greeks by Roman controversialists; and enabling the two Churches, in a few days of amicable discussion, to put in a fair way of adjustment points which have divided East and West for 848 years.

The object of the Conferences cannot be better expressed than in the words which Canon Liddon prefixed to the English translation of the first Conference, in 1874;—"When so many forms of infidelity are threatening our Christian belief on one side, and Vaticanism is putting forth its altogether new propositions about the constitution and faith of the Church of Christ on the other; ought not all we who profess to follow the ancient Catholic Church, as the keeper and upholder of the Scriptures, to be able to come to an understanding with each other? Surely this would not be impossible, unless we are stupid or self-willed."

The most important of the differences between the Greek and Anglican Churches is the ecclesiastically-unauthorized addition of the Filioque to the Nicene Creed.

At the first Conference (the sequel to an Old Catholic Congress at Freiburg), the Old Catholics were represented by Bishop Reinkens, Dr. Döllinger, and Professor Reusch. From England were present the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Harold Browne), the Dean of Chester (Dr. Howson), and Canon Liddon. From Russia, an Archpriest, Rector of the Ecclesiastical Academy of Petersburg, and Colonel Kiréef. From Athens, a Professor. It cannot be said that, at this Conference, much progress was made towards reunion; but it was agreed that the addition of the Filioque was unlawful; that "it was much to be desired that the whole Church should set itself seriously to consider whether the Creed could be restored to its primitive form, without sacrifice of any true doctrine expressed in the present Western form." Notwithstanding a proposal by Canon Liddon, that it should be allowed, not as *de fide*, but as, previously to 1854, a pious opinion, the Immaculate Conception was condemned.

At the second Conference, held in 1875 (the year in which the Romanists celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of their schism in England), the Old Catholics from Germany were represented by eighteen members, amongst whom were Bishop Reinkens, Dr. Döllinger, and three Professors; twenty Orientals, almost all men of note, were present; the venerable Archbishop Lycurgus, soon afterwards to be removed by death; two Archbishops from Romania; an Archimandrite from Belgrade; an Archpriest from Petersburg, and Professors of Theology from Petersburg, Kief, Athens, and Dalmatia. The Anglican Church was represented by fifty members (about ten being Americans); with the Bishop of Gibraltar, the Dean of Chester, and Canon Liddon. The Bishop of Winchester excused his absence on the ground of ill health;

and a letter was read from the great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, expressing sympathy with the Old Catholics.

On August 15, a series of propositions, drawn from the writings of St. John Damascene by a joint committee of Anglicans and Old Catholics, was, later in the day, submitted to a committee of Orientals. On the following day, Dr. Döllinger was enabled to announce to the full Conference, which, like the preceding Conference, was under his presidency, that on the six points of discussion, all of which were derived from St. Damascene, the representative writer of the Eastern Church, the Eastern and Western Churches were in full accord. The principal subject discussed at the Conference was the Filioque; and the following unanimous agreement was arrived at; (1) the acceptance of the Œcumenical Creeds; (2) the acknowledgment that the addition of the Filioque was not made in an ecclesiastically-regular manner; (3) The setting forth the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, as taught by the Fathers of the undivided Church; (4) The rejection of every kind of expression in which, by any means, two *principles*, or two *causes*, in the Trinity could possibly be held.

At the Conference, the validity of Anglican Orders was maintained by Dr. Döllinger. The Roman Church, in his ultramontane and pre-Vatican days, styled Dr. Döllinger the most learned theologian of the time; his joining the Old Catholics could not have altered this. "The fact," he said, "that Parker" (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1559—1565), "was consecrated by four rightly consecrated bishops, *ritè et legitimè*, with imposition of hands and the necessary words, is so well attested, that any one who chooses to deny this fact could, with the same right, doubt 100,000 facts—the Orders of the Roman

Church could be disputed with more appearance of reason."

As to the recognition by the Anglican Church of the sacramental character of Ordination, Dr. Döllinger explained that we enumerate only the two Sacraments, which are necessary for all, Baptism, and the Eucharist; whereas Ordination is limited to a few. "Whether or not," he said, "Anglicans call Ordination a Sacrament, may be regarded with indifference by the Orientals." What does affect the question is, he said, that Ordination is accompanied by laying on of hands; that the words in which the special grace is expressed are spoken; and that it is believed that a grace of the Holy Ghost is conferred by Ordination.

Two days before he gave this explanation, Dr. Döllinger drew attention to the creed known as *Decretum de Armeniis*, put forth, professedly in the name of the council, at Florence. In that creed, under the head of Ordination, the imposition of hands (the essential part), on which the validity of the consecration depends, was not once mentioned; but only the matter, the *porrectio instrumentorum* (the delivery of the chalice and paten); an unessential ceremony, and "one which did not arise for 1,000 years, and only in the West."

The absence of the *porrectio instrumentorum* at the Ordination of our priests led the Roman Church to condemn Anglican Orders; it never has been, and is not now practised in the Greek Church; in fact it *was* prescribed in the English Ordinal of 1549; but our Church returned to the primitive practice, and in the Ordinal of 1552 it was omitted.

The late Dr. Pusey objected to two propositions accepted by the Conference; (1) "we agree in acknowledg-

ing that the addition of the Filioque to the Creed did not take place in an ecclesiastically-regular manner;" (2) "the Holy Ghost does not issue out of the Son, because there is in the Godhead but one beginning, one cause, through which all that is in the Godhead is produced."

He wrote to the *Times*[1] an unfortunate letter, inveighing against the Bonn Conferences, and the union of the Greek and Anglican Churches. Dr. Pusey was respected for his piety and learning, and for his services to the Church of England; but he was not considered in the Anglican Church an authority equal to Dr. Döllinger. "The addition of the Filioque," he wrote, "is no more ecclesiastically-irregular than the additions to the Nicene Creed by the Council of Constantinople (a wholly Greek Council), for its necessities in the East." But those additions being made by a General Council (even though wholly composed of Greeks) were ecclesiastically-regular, and we hope to show presently that, since the Council of Ephesus, the situation was completely altered.

The writer of a pamphlet on the Eastern Church[m] extracts some satisfaction from, that greatest blunder of the last century, the Crimean War[n], in which England took the side of the Crescent againt the Cross.

"The beneficial result has been a quickened interest in all which concerns the doctrines and practices of the holy Eastern Church." He relates an anecdote, which, it is hoped, could not be repeated now; that an Armenian priest, being asked to give some information

[1] *Times*, December 27, 1875.

[m] *The Holy Eastern Church.*

[n] This was a relic of the Crusades. The Greeks in 1187 purchased the Holy Sepulchre from Saladin; but the Latin conquests in the Eastern Empire seemed to the Latins to give them some rights over it.

respecting the Anglican Church, allowed that we are Christians, and "even have a kind of Eucharist, such as it is;" once a year a minister goes into the pulpit with a large basket of bread, which he flings amongst the people, who scramble for it.

Acts of ecclesiastical comity between the Greek and Anglican Communities, and not least the Russian, with whom England has so much, and ought to have more, in common, have been so frequent that they need not be specified.

We will only refer to a few passages in the address of the Very Reverend Eugene Smirnof, Chaplain to the British Embassy, to the eminent scholar and divine and Member of the Holy Governing Synod, Antonius, Archbishop of Finland, who was present at the late Queen's Jubilee in 1897, in a double capacity, having the authority of the Tsar, as representative of the Russian nation, and that of the Holy Synod, as representative of the Greco-Russian Church. Speaking of the advance made in the way of reunion, he said;—"One of the occasions for this advance was afforded by the venerable crowned Mother of this land, who—at the sorrowful news of the blessed end of our Tsar-peacemaker (Alexander III.)—raised to the Most High her prayers for the repose of his soul, in the words and chants of our Church. Glory and honour to the great Mother of this land, by her warm maternal feelings, foreseeing the coming religious drawing-together of the nations. Glory and honour to the great Orthodox Russian Church, for answering with motherly tenderness to the greeting of peace and love, with a corresponding greeting of peace and love. Glory and honour to the Crowned Anointed Autocratic Monarch of All the Russias, for sending you to this country as

the messenger of peace and love; he by his heart has understood the heart of the Orthodox Russian nation, which from time immemorial has ever striven for the loving pacification of the Churches."

An extract from The Official Journal of the Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy of July 30, 1897, draws attention to the "recent events, in which has been expressed a mutual approximation and intercommunion of the greatest representatives of Eastern and Western Christianity, the Orthodox Russian and the English Churches."

Another of the principal Russian newspapers[o] says; "Everybody has realized—that any union which is either possible or necessary for the English Church to effect, with a Church based on strong organic principles, can only be a union with the Orthodox East; which has never definitely declared against English Ordinations, and which the English Church has always found it more easy to confer with than with Rome."

The revival in 1885, with the sanction of the Patriarch, of the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem is an instance of the friendly relations now existing between the Orthodox Greek and Anglican Churches. The first instance, in later years, of renewed intercourse between the Churches was the foundation, in 1841, of an Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem. Dr. Alexander, a converted Jew, was the first bishop, after whom followed Drs. Gobat and Barclay. The first bishop went out with commendatory letters from Archbishop Howley; "Our hearty desire is," he wrote, "to renew that amicable intercourse with the ancient Churches of the East, which has been suspended for ages, and which, if restored, may

[o] *The Church Messenger*, Jan. 2, 1897, O.S.

have the effect, with the blessing of God, of putting an end to divisions which have brought the most grievous calamities to the Church of Christ."

The duties of the bishop were to be confined to English and German Protestants, and such Jewish converts as might be made. The Archbishop, the head of the Church, had the support of the State; it was enacted that the bishop was to "establish and maintain, as far as in him lies, relations of Christian charity with other Churches represented at Jerusalem; and in particular with the Orthodox Greek Church; taking care that the Church of England does not wish to disturb, or divide, or interfere with them, but that she is ready, in the spirit of Christian love, to render them such offices of friendship as they may be willing to accept." It was a time when the Greek Church was little understood, and was believed in England to be as uncatholic as the Roman; the mission was mismanaged; the bishops misinterpreted their instructions; by petty aggression on their jurisdiction, they excited the indignation of the Orthodox prelates, and the bishopric had to be suppressed.

Owing to the kind and unobtrusive character of Dr. Blyth, who was appointed to the revived bishopric, the Greek and Syrian Churches have learnt to understand and appreciate the Anglican Church; to know that it is not a proselytizing Church; that it sympathizes with their difficulties, and that it wishes to strengthen, not weaken, the Orthodox Church.

On St. Luke's Day, 1898, took place an event unique, since the schism between East and West, in the annals of the Church; viz., the consecration of the Anglican Church at Jerusalem, dedicated in memory of St. George, the Patron-Saint of England, who is supposed to have

suffered martyrdom in the tenth persecution. A fund, of which the Bishop of Salisbury is treasurer, has lately been set on foot by him, for the endowment of stalls for twelve residentiary canons, four of whom are to be bishops; and the appointment to the "Olivet Stall" has already been made.

Nothing could put forth the Anglican mission in a more favourable light than the late unfortunate incident (now, we believe, happily arranged) in the Greek Church at Beyrout. The Bishop of Beyrout (an important see, comprising the Lebanon) having died at the commencement of 1901, the native Orthodox population desired to have, and elected as bishop, the Archimandrite Masserah, who had worked successfully amongst them in 1886—1887, and defeated a design of the Jesuits on the Orthodox Church. We do not purpose to enter into the politico-ecclesiastical question; but this arrangement does not appear to have commended itself to Russia, nor to the Patriarch of Antioch, who was Russia's nominee, and refused, without assigning a reason, to confirm the election.

The feelings of the people were aroused against the Patriarch, and in their trouble they had recourse to the Anglican Church at Beyrout. The English Chaplain showed himself equal to the occasion; he told the people that the Anglican Church could not in any way countenance a schism in the Orthodox Church; and his conduct met with the entire approval of Bishop Blyth; the bishop said that he had obtained the consent of Gerasimus, Patriarch of Jerusalem, that "in an emergency we might baptize for them, on the clear understanding that there was to be no re-baptism, though we agreed that they should give the Chrism, and that we should not

confirm in that case[p]." It was arranged that, during their troubles, the Orthodox Church might attend the Anglican services, and have the use of the Anglican chapel and altar, whenever the services of an Orthodox priest could be procured.

After a personal visit to Beyrout in March of the present year, the bishop, at the request of a committee (not, as he told them, *officially*, but to offer his good services), waited upon the Patriarch of Antioch, at Damascus. From the Patriarch, as also the Bishop of Tripoli, who was present at the interview, he met with scant civility; and left *re infectâ*. But on his arrival at Beyrout he was met by the assurance of the success of his visit; that on the day after he left Beyrout, a synod at Damascus had passed a resolution that Masserah should be Bishop of Beyrout.

We have given the above account to show the fraternal feeling which exists on the part of the Anglican Church towards the Greek Church. We wish we could say the same of the Roman Church, for then would the reunion of Christendom be within measurable distance. But (in the words of the Encyclical of the third Lambeth Conference) "the Church of Rome has always treated her Eastern sister wrongfully; she intrudes her bishops into the ancient dioceses, and keeps up a system of active proselytism." What the Anglican Church has done for one part of the Greek Church, she is ready to do for another, should the necessity occur.

The important document mentioned above[q], which was issued in September, 1901, refers to the formation, two years previously, of a permanent Committee at Con-

[p] Letter from the Bishop to the Chaplain.

[q] See p. 475.

stantinople, to meet, whenever it judged the occasion opportune, for the purpose of discussing the outstanding differences between the two Churches. The committee consisted of the Great Protosyncellus, Chrysostom; the Archimandrites, Photius, Principal Secretary to the Sacred Synod, and Gregory, the Great Hierokerux; and the Anglican Chaplain. Five questions on the teaching of the Church of England were submitted to the Bishop of Salisbury. A compendious sketch of its teaching was accordingly, with the approval of the two Archbishops, drawn up by the bishop[r]; as the translator of his pamphlet styles him *φιλέλλην καὶ Ἑλληνοφιλὴς καὶ φιλορθόδοξος υἱὸς πατρὸς ἀειμνήστου καὶ φιλελληνικωτάτου.*

How timely and opportune such information was may be judged from a passage in the Catechism (*Ὀρθόδοξος Κατήχησις*) of Nectarius, Metropolitan of Pentapolis, and Principal of the Theological Seminary at Athens. The learned Metropolitan makes this remarkable statement, which was current a hundred years ago, when theology was at a low ebb, but which has long ago been exploded. He says that the Anglicans or Episcopalians, though they have maintained the Priesthood and the Hierarchy of the Church, are *Protestants*, who have entirely rejected tradition.

This statement involves a thorough misconception. He must be alluding to the English, which he confuses with the foreign, Reformation, and he speaks of us as Protestants, who in the sixteenth century separated from the Western Church.

At the Diet of Spires in 1529, the Emperor and Pope having entered into an alliance to stop the Reformation

[r] "Some points in the teaching of the Church of England for the information of Orthodox Christians in the East."

in Germany, the reforming party in that country issued a protest against their action, from which they derived the name of *Protestants.* The Church of England did not interest itself in that protest; but, on March 31, 1534, the Convocation of Canterbury, and on May 5 the Convocation of York, simply agreed that "the Pope has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Holy Scripture in the kingdom of England than any other foreign bishop;" and in November of the same year the Act of Supremacy declared that the King was "the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia.*" That was the title used by Pope Gregory the Great when he sent St. Augustine into England, and the Church of England recognized (except that of Catholic) no other title. But when the Pope of Rome at the Council of Trent arrogated the title of "bishop of the Catholic Church" (a title unused by his predecessors), the Anglican Church was thenceforward Catholic and Protestant; Catholic as she had always been, and Protestant against the novel assumption of Rome.

What other word could be used? No one would accuse Archbishop Laud of being a Protestant, in the Germanic sense of the word; but in his controversy with the Jesuit Fisher he uses the word about 100 times, as no other word could adequately express his meaning. "I die in the faith of the Catholic Church before the disunion between East and West" were the dying words of the holy Ken. The Anglicana Ecclesia was well described by Archbishop Benson as "Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant."

The Roman Church constantly inveighs against the Church of England as being Protestant on the ground

of private judgment. In this respect, we imagine, the more logical Greek Church would be at one with us. The Anglican Church values authority; but God has given man an intellect and a conscience, with the injunction to "prove all things;" and no man can nourish his conscience without his intellect, any more than he can nourish his body without food. Our Thirty-nine Articles have laid down the limit of private judgment[8]: "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly." We use our intellect in rejecting certain Roman doctrines, because they are repugnant to the Word of God, and are not ordained and approved by the common authority of the Church. The logical conclusion of stifling the intellect, and trusting to mere human authority, might be that of Cardinal Bellarmine: "If the Pope should err by enjoining vices or forbidding virtues, the Church would be obliged to believe vices to be right, and virtues wrong."

For the information of those members of the Greek Church, who might be misled by unhistorical assertions, we will carry on the dealings of England with Rome till the final breach. Queen Elizabeth acknowledged, as was usual, her accession to the various Courts of Europe, and amongst others to the Pope of Rome, Paul IV. (1555—1559). The Pope thought fit to use coarse and insulting language, and interfered in the Constitution of England; he told her that she was (in allusion to her

[8] Art. XXXIV.

birth) debarred from the inheritance. His successor, Pius IV. (1560—1565), pronounced our Prayer-book to be "authentic and not repugnant to the truth," and offered to authorize it if only she would acknowledge his supremacy; but after the insulting language of his predecessor, that was impossible.

The doctrinal Reformation in England may be said to have ended with the subscription of the Thirty-nine Articles by both Houses of Convocation in 1563. Of those Articles Philaret, the great Metropolitan of Moscow, said: "there are in them many erroneous propositions, such as could not be allowed with us." But they must have been meant to be taken in a Catholic and Orthodox sense; for the same synod which imposed them recommended to preachers to preach nothing "except what is conformable to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have thence collected." Article XX. asserts, "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith."

The unreformed members of the community were settling down in peace and quietness, frequenting the churches, and conforming to the services of the Church of England, when, on April 22, 1570, Pope Pius V. (1566—1572) issued the Bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, excommunicating "the pretended Queen of England," and absolving her subjects from their allegiance.

No such obstacles to reunion between the Greek and Anglican Churches exist, as the modern Roman dogmas of 1564, 1854, and 1870, the Creed of Pope Pius IV., the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, and Papal Infallibility. No overt act has ever separated the two Churches; Cardinal Humbert excommunicated

the Greek Church, and Michael Cerularius the Roman Church, at the time when we were in Communion with it. A slight knowledge of history suffices to show that England was not politically, or ecclesiastically, mixed up in the affairs of Rome. Twelve years after the schism commenced, William I., a devoted son of the Pope, who sent him to Hastings with a consecrated banner, became King of England. For three hundred years previously no Papal legates had been allowed in England. William I. Normandized England, he did not Romanize the old Ecclesia Anglicana. The Norman Conquest coincides with the time when Papal pretensions were carried to their greatest height. In 1073 the imperious Hildebrand became Pope as Gregory VII. (1073—1085). Knowing that the King lay under obligations to the Papacy, he thought the time opportune to impose the Roman yoke upon England, and demanded that the King should do fealty (*fidelitas*) to him. The King refused, and the reason is significant; "I do not find that my predecessors have professed it to yours." When (as was frequently the case) there were more Popes than one, he would allow no one in his dominions to acknowledge "the Pontiff of the city of Rome," except with his consent. No Papal letters could be received, until he had first seen them; no Papal legates land in England without the royal license; no suit be carried to Rome without his sanction. John *did* do fealty to the Pope, but John was not a King of whom England is prouder than the Greeks were of the Palæologi; and England, headed by its Archbishop, as speedily repudiated the act, as the Greeks did in the latter case. Before he closed his eyes to history, the late Cardinal Manning wrote:—"If any one will look along the line of English Church his-

tory, he will see a standing contest between the rulers of this land and the bishops of Rome. The Crown and Church of England, with a steady opposition, resisted the entrance and encroachment of the secularized ecclesiastical power of the Pope in England. The last act was no more than a successful effort, after many failures in struggles of a like kind[t]." A man may change his religion, but he cannot change history.

"I wis," says our own pious Bishop Hall, "it will be long enough before we wrangle ourselves into Heaven." The friendly relations which have been established between the Greek and Anglican Churches are a guarantee that, when steps are taken for a closer union between the Churches, the matter will be conducted in a spirit of charity and forbearance; and it is to be hoped that the time is not far distant when members of the Greek and Anglican Communities, in either country, may feel less like ecclesiastical outcasts than they do at present.

We need not dwell on the many points which we have in common. National Churches; the principle of a vernacular language in the Church services; an open Bible. Russia can never forget that England gave her, what many Russians regard as the mainstay, not of their religion only, but of their national life, the Bible, in a language which their people can understand. In the Russian and Anglican Churches, the Bible and Orthodoxy go hand in hand together. No Church in its daily services reads so much of the Bible, as the Church of England; fiction allows that a Russian loves his Bible better than his Vodka. Close to the Nikolski gate of the Kremlin, there is, or was, a shop for the sale of cheap

[t] Manning *On the Unity of the Church.*

Bibles, with the inscription, "Zabluzhdaetes Ne Znaya Pisania" (*ye do greatly err in not knowing the Scriptures*). Mr. Mackenzie Wallace speaks of the great knowledge of the Bible existing amongst the Russian peasants, some of them seeming to know the new Testament by heart. M. Le Roy Beaulieu says, that there is in Russia a greater demand for Bibles than in any non-Protestant country. "We are now at length," said Count Pratasof, Procurator of the Holy Governing Synod, to Rev. W. Palmer, "finding, even in the Bible itself, an antidote to the abuse of the Bible."

We will conclude this work with a few remarks on the unfortunate introduction, which many Anglicans equally with Greeks deplore, of the Filioque into the Western Creed.

Some allowance must be made for the different circumstances of the Eastern and Western Churches in the early days of Christianity.

Rufinus in his "Commentary on the Apostles' Creed," which Gennadius[u] says, "was so excellent that other expositions were regarded of no account in comparison," comments on a Creed which corresponds almost word for word with the Apostles' Creed[x]. The so-called Apostles' Creed is doubtless older than the Nicene Creed; and such a Creed, *mutatis mutandis*, was from the first the Creed of the Western Church; although the statement of Rufinus that each Apostle contributed a clause, is improbable. But the Arian heresy arose, and the Christological controversies agitated the East at the

[u] Vir. Ill. sub. Rufinus.

[x] The only differences are that after "I believe in God the Father Almighty," it has the words "invisible and impassible;" and "was born of the Virgin Mary by the Holy Ghost."

time when the West was convulsed with Pelagianism, or the denial of Original Sin. Whilst, therefore, the Eastern Church was contending against errors concerning the Nature of Christ, for which the Nicene Creed was particularly adapted, the office of the Western Church was to dwell on the Atonement, as the sole means of expiating Original and Actual sin. For this purpose the Apostles' Creed was well suited; and we have found St. Hilary of Poitiers protesting that he had never heard of the *ὁμοούσιον*, in other words, that he had never heard of the Nicene Creed, till he went into banishment; i.e., A.D. 356[y].

As to the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, both Churches are, we imagine, in agreement. Article VIII. of the Thirty-nine Articles says that the three Creeds "may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture;" the Vth Article speaks of "the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son." In like manner the Greek Church holds a twofold Procession; (1) *eternal*, by which He proceeds from the Father; (2) *temporal*, by which He manifests Himself through the Son; ("Whom I will send you from the Father," St. John xv. 26). The Anglican, equally with the Greek, Church, discards the notion of two principles (*ἀρχαί*), or two Causes (*αἰτίαι*).

St. Epiphanius speaks of *Πνεῦμα παρὰ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ λάμβανον*[z]. St. John Damascene of *Δύναμις τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ ἐκπορευομένη*[a]. *Εἰκὼν τοῦ Πατρὸς ὁ Υἱὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ το Πνεῦμα*[b]. *Ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ το Πνεῦμα οὐ λέγομεν, Πνεῦμα δὲ Υἱοῦ ὀνομάζομεν*[c].

[y] See p. 55. [z] Anch. 7. [a] De Fid. Orth. I. 12.
[b] Ibid. I. 13. [c] Ibid. I. 8.

The second Bonn Conference expressed its agreement with the teaching of St. John Damascene.

Two great Latin Fathers, SS. Augustine and Ambrose, go further, in maintaining that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. St. Augustine; "non possumus dicere quod Spiritus Sanctus a Filio non procedat; neque enim frustrà Spiritus et Patris et Filii dicitur[d]." And again; "non ab utroque est genitus, sed ab utroque procedit[e]." St. Ambrose says; "a Patre et Filio procedit[f]."

St. Epiphanius, writing after the First, and previously to the Second Œcumenical Council, gives in full two creeds, as existing in his time[g], a shorter, which he says the Church received from the Apostles, and a longer creed. From the former, he says, the Council of Nicæa extracted so much as was required for its purpose, viz., the refutation of the Arian heresy. But, he says, every catechumen at his Baptism, from the Council of Nicæa till A.D. 373, used, not the Nicene form, but the shorter creed. In the reigns of Valentinian, Valens, and Gratian, when the heresies of Apollinaris and others infested the Church, the longer creed was adopted, to meet the case of those heretics.

Expansion of the Nicene Creed was from time to time required to meet local requirements, but everywhere the Nicene was taken as the basis of local creeds; the Antiochene creed given by Cassian[h] underwent revision, in order to adopt Nicene phraseology. Sozomen speaks[i] of "the adherents of Hosius" at Sardica compiling "another faith to that of Nicæa, although the same thought (*τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν*) was preserved."

[d] De Trin. IV. 20. [e] Ibid. [f] De Spir. Sanc.
[g] Anch. 118, 119. Lib. VI. 3. [i] H.E. III. 12.

Local Churches, therefore, at that time, were not bound to the exact words, although they were to the doctrine, of the Nicene Creed; and the Creed as amplified at the Council of Constantinople came to be considered Nicene; for the first canon of that Council enacted that "the Creed of the 318 Fathers assembled at Nicæa was not to be abolished."

At the Council of Ephesus (which took no notice of the Council of Constantinople) it was enacted that no one should alter the Creed (*πίστιν*) agreed to at Nicæa. The Council of Chalcedon, whilst it refused to insert the doctrine that Mary was *Theotokos*, because it was unlawful to alter the Nicene Creed[k]; yet, having first recited the Creed under the Nicene form, afterwards recited it under that of Constantinople; the Nicene and Constantinopolitan forms were taken as one Creed; and it was the latter which was incorporated in the *Definitio Fidei*, with the injunction that "no one should be permitted to bring forward—any other faith." The Council declared that it taught "*perfection* about the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" (*περὶ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ἐκδιδάσκει τὸ τέλειον*). The injunction was re-affirmed by the Fifth and Sixth Œcumenical Councils.

The Constantinopolitan form usurped the title of Nicene, and it is by that title that it is called in the present day; and the Church has the benefit of possessing its Creed, without the anathemas of Nicæa.

The Creed was adopted into its Liturgy, first by the Greek Church, as is supposed by Peter Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch; and from the East it was imported into

[k] See p 146.

the West at the third Council of Toledo, A.D. 589: "Petitione Reccaredi Regis constituit synodus ut—secundum formam Orientalium Ecclesiarum, Constantinopolitanæ fidei symbolus recitetur." But it was the Eastern Creed, with the uncanonical and unscriptural addition of the Filioque to the Procession of the Holy Ghost, "Who," in our Saviour's own words, "proceedeth from the Father" (*παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται*). The Synod, following the so-called Creed of St. Athanasius, might have thought that the additional words were calculated to prevent the Spanish Church from relapsing into Arianism, from which it had recently (A.D. 587) been converted. But an Œcumenical Council had declared its definition of the Procession to be "perfect." Or the Synod might have imagined, (as many learned scholars now hold), that there is an etymological difference between the Greek *ἐκπορεύεσθαι* and the Latin *procedere;* that the words *ex Patre et Filio* are necessary, to convey to the Western mind the meaning that the *ἐκ Πατρὸς* of the Councils do to the subtler Eastern mind.

This was the line adopted by St. Anselm at the synod of Bari, which he attended when a fugitive from England, in 1097. He proved to the Greeks, who were numerous in the Province of Apulia, that though the Filioque was added in an irregular manner, it did not contravene the general meaning of the Greek Church. The Holy Spirit, he argued, is God of God, as is also the Son; He proceeds from the Father, not as Father, but as God; whence it follows that he proceeds also from the Son, who is God equally with the Father[1]. An ana-

[1] "Ita pertractavit questionis latera, ita penetravit et enubilavit interna, ut Latini clamore testarentur gaudium, Græci de se præbere dolerent ridiculum." William of Malmesbury.

thema was pronounced by the council on all who denied the doctrine.

So also Popes Adrian I. and Leo III., although they opposed Charlemagne's wish that it should be introduced into the Œcumenical Creed, agreed in the truth of the doctrine.

The first acknowledgment of the double Procession by the Church of England was, strange to say, at the synod of Hatfield in 680, under the Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore. Cardinal Humbert, as we have already seen, in his controversy with Cerularius, accused the Greeks with having erased the Filioque from the Creed ("absciderunt a symbolo"). When the Greeks complained to the four nuncios sent by Pope Gregory IX. to the conference at Nymphæum, under John Ducas Vatatzes[m], of the addition to the Creed, the nuncios answered:—"we have introduced no new matter; the Filioque is only a word of explanation of the doctrine, already contained in the words of the Creed;" against them the Patriarch Germanus asserted that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son. When, at the council of Ferrara, the prohibition of the Council of Ephesus was discussed, it was argued by the Latins that they had preserved the *norma credendi;* that the Filioque was an explanation, not an addition; and they retaliated by saying that, since the Council, the Greeks themselves had added words, explanatory of the Nicene form, against Eastern heresies; and that all Greek MSS. did not contain the words "from Heaven," nor "according to the Scriptures."

We have made the above remarks, not to defend the

[m] See p. 300.

addition to the Creed, but to explain it. It was one of the heirlooms left us by Rome, and probably escaped the notice of our Reformers.

Till lately there existed in England a society entitled the *Nicene Creed Association*, having for its object "its restoration to its true form, as sanctioned by the General Councils, by the removal of the unauthorized addition 'and the Son;' and the re-insertion of the word 'Holy' before the words 'Catholic and Apostolic Church.'" The society is, we believe, to be replaced by another of wider scope, but having the same object in view.

As recently as January in the present year, a "humble Memorial" was presented to, and allowed to lie on the table of, the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, setting forth that "a most serious and weighty grievance" is felt, that "the clergy and laity of the Church of England generally should be required to profess a Creed, differing in so momentous a subject from that which the primitive Church, through her great Councils, has handed down to posterity."

We do not venture to predict the fate of the Memorial. It is difficult, however desirable it might be, to alter the Creed, as recited in the Church of England for over a thousand years; which Dr. Pusey called "our hereditary Creed," and which our own St. Anselm declared to be agreeable to the truth. "Custom without truth," says St. Cyprian[n], "is only antiquity of error." But since the doctrine is not repugnant to the Truth; since the Filioque in the Creed refers only to the *eternal Procession;* would not an explanation, such as was pre-

[n] Ep. LXXIV.

sented to Convocation by the Commissioners on the Prayer-book in 1689, meet the difficulty? "It is humbly submitted to Convocation whether a note might not here be added with relation to the Greek Church, in order to our maintaining Catholic Communion."

APPENDIX I.

Letter of Philaret (afterwards Metropolitan of Moscow) to Dr. Pinkerton, Author of "The present state of the Greek Church in Russia."

"Dear Sir,

"Permit me to communicate to you, in accordance with your own desire, what struck me in reading certain parts of your work [entitled, *The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia*, 1814] respecting the state of learning among the clergy of Russia. To the four spiritual academies, which have the duty of preparing teachers for the eparchial seminaries, must be added the seminary [since made one of the four academies] of Troitza (about sixty miles to the north of Moscow); a high school, which has had a distinguished part in the revival of learning among the clergy of Russia in modern times. In the year 1812, when its great supporter Platon died, there were fourteen bishops and archbishops of the Russian Church, two of them metropolitans, who had received their education there under that enlightened prelate.

"The course in the spiritual schools is at present as follows:—'Several parishes have a common school for the sons of the clergy; and these parochial schools are under the superintendence of the central school of the district [the circle or riding], in which the boys have to pass a course of four years. In this period they are taught the Russ, Slavonian, Latin, and Greek grammars, together with geography, sacred history, the catechism

and church singing. The district schools are under the control of the eparchial seminary, which is usually attached to the residence of the bishop of the see. You say [p. 15] that 'promotion to the rank of bishop depends entirely on the will of the sovereign.' The Russian Church is not of this opinion. She, in the choice of bishops, follows the practice of the first Churches, in which this choice depended upon the clergy and laity unitedly. But the extent of the Russian Church being such that, not only the clergy of so many dioceses, but even the clergy and the people of one diocese could not have an opportunity of assembling to choose their bishop, therefore the choice is left to the Synod as representing the clergy, and to the Emperor as representative of the people; and with a view to observe the order of election, and to prevent differences of opinion, the Synod proposes to the Emperor two candidates for the bishopric, and he selects one of them.

"In Russia there are three ranks of monastic houses: Lavras, Monasteries, and Hermitages [Poustini]. The three lavras have the metropolitans of the respective dioceses, where they are situated, for their archimandrites. Exclusive of the lavras, some of the monasteries, which are denominated *stauropegiæ*, are placed under the immediate jurisdiction of the Synod. The remainder of the monasteries and hermitages are under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese. The monasteries are divided into three classes, of which the two first have *archimandrites*, and the third partly archimandrites and partly *hegoumens* over them. The hermitages are mostly governed by *superiors*. In the lavras, and in most of the monasteries, the monks have a common table; but they must provide their clothing from their own allowances.

or private resources. In the hermitages they have no kind of personal property, and complete fraternal equality and obedience are strictly observed.

"I know not whence you have taken your ideas of the caprice of the Russian Patriarchs in former times [see p. 32, where we read that, 'when Peter ascended the throne the power of the Patriarch was almost equal to that of the Tsar;' and that 'it not unfrequently happened that the Patriarch opposed his voice to that of the Tsar and nobles in national affairs of importance for no other reason but because he had not been previously consulted']. The opinion that the power of the clergy might be a dangerous opponent to the civil power, as it respects Russia, is a mere prejudice; though, in the preceding century, it had even taken hold of the minds of some Russian authors.

"It is wrong to compare the throne of the Popes with that of the Russian Patriarchs. The Russian hierarch never aspired after any triple tiara, or after the sword which belongs unto Cæsar. The most zealous of them were witnesses of the truth before the throne of their sovereigns; and if for that they fell under their displeasure, they submitted without resistance. Out of the small number of her Patriarchs, the Russian Church has even had such as have suffered for the empire—Hermogenes; but, thanks be to God! she never had any from whom the empire suffered. But why then, you will say, did Peter change the Patriarchal for the Synodal government? The principal cause of this change was probably the following: that the power of the clergy concentrated in the Patriarch might not oppose the rapidity of the other great changes which the ardent spirit of Peter had already undertaken. For it was a constant maxim of

the Russian clergy never to abandon, without important reasons, the ancient customs; and even to beware of bringing the minds of the people into agitation by the introduction of novelties, the utility of which was not clearly manifest. If, for instance, he had asked the Russian clergy whether it were necessary for the civilisation of the Russians to oblige them to dress like foreigners, and to cut off their beards, most likely the answer would have been—that short clothes do not civilise a man, neither doth a beard make him a barbarian; that from civilised foreigners we should adopt only that which is necessary and useful; but that we ought not to depress the national spirit with their fashions, and thereby accustom the people to a blind imitation merely; that it would be better to promote the sciences and the arts by the gradual improvement of the Russians themselves, than to deliver up the spirit and power of the people into the hands of foreigners. But the powerful and active spirit of Peter could not endure any limits or delay in the execution of his plans: he wished to change all things at once, forgetting that, according to the laws of nature, that only which grows up gradually is likely to be lasting and substantial.

"The Ober-Prokuror of the Synod is *by no means* the head of it, as stated in your book. Not being of the clerical order, he is not even so much as a member of the Synod. He is merely the guardian of the laws attached to the Synod, a witness of its transactions on the part of the Crown, and the medium of intercourse between it and the sovereign. Neither has the Senate any power over the Synod. These two courts are on an equality. These are the remarks which appeared to me most necessary on perusing your work.

"And for your just esteem of his late eminence Platon, receive my especial thanks, which are also for ever due to him; and be assured of the sincere and perfect esteem with which I have the honour to remain your humble servant,

"PHILARET, Archimandrite, &c.

"Dated St. Petersburgh, October 26th, 1814."

APPENDIX II.

(*See p.* 476.)

THE ORTHODOX PATRIARCHATE AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

"THE Orthodox Church of the East, always obedient to the voice of its Founder, Who said regarding those who believe in Him, 'Holy Father, keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one' (John xvii. 11), not only prays repeatedly day by day 'for the union of all,' but neglects not one opportunity given to it that the scattered members of the Church may be again gathered together, that the schisms of communions may cease, that the revolts of heresies may be subdued, and that all men may be made sons of light and sons of day, for the glory of Christ and the praise of His holy Church.

"The Great Church of Christ, seeing the same yearning from very ancient times, animates the Episcopal Church in England, which is called the Anglican Church, as has been manifested on many occasions, and first, indeed, in the year of grace, 1723, when the Anglican Church even

officially expressed an earnest desire for union with the Orthodox Eastern Church; and secondly, in the years 1866, 1867, and 1868, when it transmitted its official confession of faith to the Patriarch, Gregory VI., of blessed memory, through the well-to-be-remembered Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury, who manifested sentiments of tender love and deep reverence towards the Orthodox Eastern Church; and later, on the occasion of the visit to England of the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, Alexander Lycurgus, when again proofs of sincere desire for an understanding with the Orthodox communion were given (the Greek Church seeing all this), not only in the year 1723 transmitted brotherly letters from its most holy Orthodox Patriarchs to the Anglican communion, addressing them, 'To the Most Reverend Bishops, and to the Reverend Priests, and to all the Clergy of the Anglican Episcopal Church,' but later issued, by the hand of Patriarch Gregory VI., a circular whereby the Orthodox clergy were bidden that in cases where no Anglican priest be available, they should attend to the burial of Anglican Christians departed in the Lord and pray for their repose.

"Passing over other instances of more remote times, on which the Orthodox Patriarchs of the East issued letters of thanksgiving to the Archbishops of Canterbury, as did also the sacred synod of the Church of Greece, for the philorthodox sentiments of the Anglicans, and for their love and reverence towards our communion; of which sentiments the ever-to-be-remembered Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, Alexander, was the object during his visit to England; we will here refer primarily to the truly brotherly letters, full of pure and enlightened Christian love, which were exchanged in the year of

grace 1899, between his Holiness the late Patriarch of Constantinople, Lord Constantine V., and the most Reverend Frederick, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England; and we will also refer to the most Christian Evangelical assurances of reciprocal charity and reverence of the two Churches exchanged between the said Patriarch and the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Salisbury, on his visit to him at the Patriarchate: those assurances serving as a seal set on this earnest and sincere longing for an understanding between the two Churches, which, with the help of God, is destined in time to make straight the way of the Lord, and to prepare the road whereby Christian truth and orthodoxy is to advance in the future, for the meeting together and union of the Churches.

"We will finally refer to the formation two years ago, and by august Patriarchal command, of a permanent committee, which, composed on the one part of the learned and reverend Great Protosyncellus Chrysostom, and of the Archimandrites, the Principal Secretary of the Sacred Synod, Photius, and the Great Hierokeryx Gregory, and on the other part, of the Chaplain of the Anglican Church in Constantinople, the Rev. Theodore Dowling, was to meet whenever it judged the occasion opportune, in order to consider, examine, and discuss the outstanding points of disagreement and difference between the two Churches. This committee met and held many and long sittings. The results of its labours, after a many-sided study and discussion of each question, has been, up to the present time at least, the resolution that there should be published a statement of the principal points of the teaching of the Church of England, addressing itself clearly and succinctly to

the most important questions on which the Anglican Church is at variance with the Orthodox Church of the East; so that our people may acquire a more accurate conception and more clear information in respect to that great part of Christendom which is called the Anglican Church. This work has been accomplished, and is due to the dexterous and masterly pen of the Right Reverend, the zealous and earnest John, Lord Bishop of Salisbury. It contains the teaching of the Church of England in the form of answers to the following questions formulated by the said committee; (*a*) What is the official confession of the Church of England? Where is it contained, and what is its binding force or validity? (*b*) What does the Church of England teach about the infallibility of the Church and about the Œcumenical Councils? (*c*) What does the Church of England teach concerning faith and good works? that is to say, what requirements does it lay down for salvation and justification? (*d*) How many Sacraments (mysteries) does the Church of England receive? What does it teach in general about Sacraments, and in particular concerning Baptism, Eucharist, and Holy Orders (*lit.* Priesthood)? (*e*) What does the Church of England teach about predestination, about the procession of the Holy Spirit, and about tradition? The publication of these (questions and answers) in the official organ of the Patriarchate is intended to move such of the orthodox theologians of the East as may be wishful to examine, judge, appreciate, and analyse the teaching therein contained, in a spirit of brotherly love and charity.

"And now, on the impending departure from the reigning city of the Reverend Theodore Dowling, the committee, full of thankfulness for all the pains and labours

which he contributed in promoting this good and godly work, but also full of regret at his early separation from us, and in order to perpetuate the remembrance of this loving co-operation in which the committee were engaged, even unto this last sitting, guided by a spirit of Christian fellowship, the committee, with the approval and permission of his Holiness Joachim III., who so worthily presides at the Œcumenical Throne, has drawn up this Act as a special document, and has delivered three true and exact copies of the same to the Reverend Theodore Dowling. The committee at the same time express no small thanks to the advocate, Mr. Michael Theotokas, who is well versed in the English language, and distinguished by his earnestness and interest in all good things, and who volunteered to act as interpreter to the committee.

"Done at the Patriarchate, this the 14th day of September, feast of the Raising of the Precious and Life-giving Cross, in the year of grace, 1901.

(Signed)

+ THE GREAT PROTO-SYNCELLUS CHRYSOSTOM.

+ THE ARCHIMANDRITE PHOTIUS, Principal Secretary to the Sacred Synod.

+ THE ARCHIMANDRITE GREGORY, Great Hierokeryx."

APPENDIX III.

Very Rev. E. Metallinos' "Imperial and Royal Coronation."

After the present work was in print, the author received from the Very Rev. E. Metallinos, Archimandrite at Manchester, a learned little book just published by him at the University Press, Oxford, entitled *Imperial and Royal Coronation*. The approaching Coronation, it says, "cannot fail to arouse the interest of the Greek people." Its object is to draw attention to the connection between the Consecration-services of the Greek, Russian, and English Churches, thus forming another link between them. It speaks of "the affectionate regard and devotion" of the Greeks "to the English dynasty and the high-minded and liberty-loving English people;" but it also contains a passage now so common in the intercourse between members of the Greek and Anglican Communions. "The Greek and the Anglican Churches are daily advancing to greater communion, as witness the exchange of Episcopal letters conceived in a truly brotherly spirit, the great honour in which their respective hierarchies are mutually held, and the interest manifested by each in the spiritual welfare of the other." Into the Coronation-services of the three Churches space prevents our entering.

INDEX.

Abasside, Caliph, 331.
Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, 339.
Abu Bekr, 189, 190.
Abulpharagius, 216.
Abuna, 221.
Abyssinians, 209, 220, 221.
Acacians, 74.
Acacius, Novatian bishop, 33.
——— of Cæsarea, 56, 58, 62, 67, 68, 71—75, 82, 83.
——— of Constantinople, 157, 159—163.
Acephali, 161, 163, 164, 175.
Achillas, 29.
Acholius, 90, 95, 103.
Acœmetæ, 156.
Acre, 291, 298.
Adalbert, 263.
Adhimer, 290.
Adrian of Moscow, 21, 432.
——— I., Pope, 240, 245.
——— II., ——— 269.
Adrianople, Treaty of, 453, 456.
Aetius (Anomœan), 68, 74.
——— of Constantinople, 144, 145.
Agapetus, Pope, 171, 172.
Agatho, Pope, 200, 201.
Agilulf, 238.
Air, the, 25.
Akerman, Convention of, 453, 456.
Akmet, 384.
Alaric, 121.
Alexander of Alexandria, 29, 30—32, 42.
——— of Antioch, 120.
——— of Constantinople, 33, 50, 51.
——— Bp. at Jerusalem, 487, 488.
——— of Lithuania, 387, 388.
——— Nevski, 374, 375, 432.
——— of Novgorod, 404.
——— I., Tsar, 447, 453—455.
——— IV., Pope, 303, 371.
——— VI., ——— 387.
Alexandria, persecution at, 60.
——— See of, 1, 3, 38, 100, 151
——— Synods at, 78, 100, 113.
——— taking of, 186, 193.
Alexandrof, 395, 396.
Alexis, St., 378.
——— Tsar, 419, 425, 429.
Alexius of Constantinople, 278, 279.
——— I., Emperor, 288.
——— III., ——— 293.
——— IV., ——— 293, 294.
——— V., ——— 294, 295.
Alfred. 202.
Ali, 190, 191.
Ali, Mahomet, 218.
Alp Arslan, 288.
Ambo, 7, 25.
Ambrose, St., 84, 90, 102, 103, 105—107.
Amharic language, 221.
Ammianus Marcellinus, 76.
Amrou, 193.
Amurath I., 315.
Anaphora, 23, 25.
Anastasia Romanof, 392, 394.
——— of Gregory Nazianzen, 93, 97.
Anastasius I., of Antioch, 176.
——— II., ——— 185.
——— of Constantinople, 234, 236.
——— of Jerusalem, 156, 166, 204.
——— Emperor, 162—164, 166, 169.
——— I., Pope, 113.
——— II., ——— 168.
Anatolius, 141—143, 152, 153.
Ancyra, Synod at, 70.
Andrew Bogoliupski, 369.
Andronicus II., 308.
——— III., 310, 312.
Anglican Orders, 472, 473, 476, 484, 485.
Anglicana Ecclesia, 492.
Angora, battle of, 317.
Anicetus, 35.

Anna, wife of Vladimir I., 275, 359—362.
——— Stephen Batory, 409.
Anne of Savoy, 312, 314, 315.
Anomœans, 68—70, 73, 74, 98, 101.
Anselm, St., 501, 503.
Answers of the Patriarch Jeremias, 335.
Anthimus of Constantinople, 171, 172, 457.
——— of Tyana, 87, 88.
Anthusa, 107.
Antidoron, 24, 26.
Antiminsia, 8.
Antioch, earthquakes at, 171.
——— Synod at, 60.
——— taken by Crusaders, 289, 290.
——— ——— Persians, 186.
——— ——— Saracens, 298.
Antonina, 172.
Antoninus of Ephesus, 109.
——— Archbishop of Finland, 486.
Antony, St., 50, 52, 53.
——— founder of Pechersky monastery, 365.
——— Arnaud, 347.
Apollinarians, 97, 98.
Apollinarius of Alexandria, 176, 177.
——— of Laodicea, 98.
Apostles' Creed, 497, 498.
Apostolicæ Curæ, Bull, 473.
Appanages, 366, 377, 388.
Apthardocetæ, 178.
A.P.U.C., 465, 466.
Aquileia, Council of, 102.
Arabic Pentateuch, 340.
Arcadius, 106, 111, 112, 116—118, 134.
Archbishops, 88.
Archimandrites, 4.
Argobastes, 105.
Ariadne, 163, 164.
Arianism, 61, 66—73, 89, 95, 107, 108.
Arians, 59, 74 *sq.*, 92, 93, 98, 102, 103, 170.
Arius, 29—32, 34, 43, 49—51, 98.
Arles, Councils of, 36, 63.
Armenia, 277.
Armenian Church, 224—227.
Armenians, 209, 224, 225.
Arsacidæ, 225.
Arsacius, 117.
Arsenius, Meletian Bishop, 47—49, 58.
——— of Constantinople, 301, 303, 308.
——— of Lybia, 352.
Artavasdes, 236.
Asclepas, 33, 53, 54, 58.
Askold, 356, 357.
Assyrian Mission, 214.
Asterisk, 24.
Asterius, 109, 110.
Athanasius, St., of Alexandria, 32, 42—66 *sq.*, 94, 113, 116, 220.
——— II., ——— 162, 165, 166.
——— of Antioch, 195.
——— of Constantinople, 343.
——— of Moscow, 394, 395.
——— Creed of, 501.
——— Tome of, 79.
Atticus, 118, 120, 122, 134.
Attila, 143.
Athens, riots at, 460.
Augsburg Confession, 332, 333, 410.
Augustine, St., of Hippo, 84, 126, 133, 134.
Aurelius, 133.
Auxentius, 65, 84.
Avignon, Popes at, 310, 311.
Aymeric, 228.
Azymites, 19.
Azyms, 281, 301.

Babuæus, 211.
Babylonish Captivity, 310.
Bagdad, 212, 275.
Bajazet I., 316, 317.
——— II., 330.
Baldwin, Count of Flanders, 295.
——— II., Emperor, 302, 303.
Baptism, 14—16.
Barbarossa, 291.
Bardas, 255—257, 267.
Bari, Archbishop of, 473.
——— Synod of, 501.
Barlaam of Calabria, 312—314.
——— ——— Moscow, 389, 390.
——— ——— Pechersky Monastery, 365.
——— ——— Rostof, 405.

Barnabas, St., 129.
Barsumas, 139, 154.
——— of Nisibis, 219, 211.
Basil of Ancyra, 50, 58 *sq.*, 70, 73, 74, 78.
——— Antioch, 156.
——— the Great, 73 *sq.*, 91, 92.
——— I., Emperor, 267—269.
——— II., ——— 275—277.
——— III., Grand Prince, 380.
——— IV., ——— 380, 381.
——— V., ——— 388—390.
——— St., Liturgy of, 19.
Basilicus, Emperor, 159, 160.
Basire, Dr. Isaac, 349.
Basle, Council of, 318, 320.
Batou, 371, 373.
Baukalis, 29.
Belisarius, 172.
Bema, 6—8, 23, 25.
Benedict IX., Pope, 471.
——— XII., ——, 313.
Benson, Archbishop, 214.
Berka, 376.
Berlin, Treaty of, 462.
Bernard, St., of Clairvaux, 291.
Bessarion, 321, 322, 324.
Bethlehem, Synod of, 347.
Beyrout, 489, 490.
Beziers, Council at, 64.
Bible in Russia, 496.
—— Slavic, 413.
Bibliotheca of Photius, 253.
Bishops, Consecration of, 244.
Blackmore, Mr., 22, 335.
Blyth, Bishop, 488, 489.
Bohemia, conversion of, 262, 263.
Boleslav the Cruel, 262.
——— Duke of Poland, 263.
——— King of Poland, 366.
Boniface IX., Pope, 316.
Bonn, Conferences at, 481, 482, 485, 499.
Boris, Tsar of Bulgaria, 262, 265, 268.
—— Godunof, 401, 402, 404, 416.
Borsevoi, 262.
Bosnia, 461, 462.
Boyars, 359, 373, 390, 391, 401, 418, 425.
Bread, leavened and unleavened, 19, 280, 281, 323.
Brest, Synods at, 413.
Bucharest, Treaty of, 453, 456.
Bulgaria, 261, 268, 270, 277, 461.
Byron, Lord, 455.

Cæcilian, 33.
Cæsarea, persecution at, 91.
Cæsarius, 87.
Cairo, 275.
Caliphs, 190.
Callinicus, 207.
Calvinists, 335, 347.
Candidian, 126—128, 139.
Canonical Hours, 12.
Cantoir Courts, 438.
Capo d'Istrias, 456.
Carthage, Council at, 133.
——— Fall of, 194.
Casimir I., 264.
——— IV., 387.
Catechumens, 25.
Cathari, 38.
Catherine I., 442.
——— II., 227, 445, 447.
Catholicos, 225—227.
Cecropius, 71.
Celestine, Pope, 125—127, 129, 132, 134.
Celibacy, clerical, 39, 40.
Chalcedon, 4th Œcumenical Council at, 88, 101, 143 *sq.*, 208, 209, 225, 226.
Chalice, 24, 26.
Charisius, 128, 129.
Charlemagne, 238, 245—247, 259, 260.
Charles of Anjou, 302, 305, 308.
——— I. of England, 340.
——— V. of Germany, 331.
——— IX. of Sweden, 410.
Cherson, 359, 360.
Choir, 6.
Chorepiscopi, 38
Chosroes II., 185.
Choudof monastery, 378.
Christians of St. Thomas, 222.
Christmas-day, 11, 19.
Christotokos, 124.
Chronicle of Eusebius, 93.
Chrysanthus, 353.
Chrysaphius, 135, 136, 138, 141, 142.

Chrysoberges, 369, 370.
Chrysopolis, Monastery of, 197.
Chrysostom, St., 107—120, 134.
———— Liturgy of, 19, 23.
———— Great Protosyncellus, 491.
Clement of Bulgaria, 265.
———— Kief, 368, 369.
Clement III., Pope, 367.
——— IV., —— 305.
——— V., —— 311.
——— VI., —— 314.
——— VII., —— 317.
——— VIII., —— 413.
Clergy, dress and vestments of, 9.
——— marriage of, 3, 39, 40.
Clermont, Council of, 18, 19, 289.
Code of Justinian, 180.
Codex Alexandrinus, 340.
Cœnobitic life, 85.
Comana, 119.
Communion in both Kinds, 18.
Compton, Bishop of London, 350.
Confession, 26.
———— of Faith, by Epiphanius, 97.
———— Cyril Lucar, 341, 342, 347.
Confirmation, 101.
Consistorial Courts, 437.
Constance, 61.
———— Council at, 18, 318.
Constans I., 52, 57, 61.
———— II., 198—200.
Constantia, 43.
Constantina, 183.
Constantine I. of Constantinople, 200.
———— II. ———— 237—239.
———— III. ———— 286.
———— of Kief, 369.
———— Prince of Ostrog, 413.
———— Pope, 207.
———— I. (the Great), 29, 31, 32, 41 *sq.*, 103, 104, 225.
———— II., 50, 52, 56.
———— IV. (Pogonatus), 200, 204.
———— V. (Copronymus), 236—239
Constantine VI. (Porphyrogenitus), 240.
———— VII. ———— 273.
————VIII. 275, 276, 278.
———— IX. (Monomachus), 279, 283, 285.
——— ——— XI. (Dragases), 325—328.
Constantinople, 2nd Œcumenical Council, 95—102.
———— 5th ———— Council, 176—178.
———— 6th ———— Council, 200—203.
———— Iconoclastic Council, 236—238.
———— Synods at, 49, 50, 74, 102, 109, 116, 136, 182, 200—203, 204—207, 249, 251, 266, 268, 269, 271, 306.
Constitutum of Vigilius, 177, 178.
Copts, 155, 193, 209, 216, 217.
Cordova, 275.
Cosmas, 235.
Covel, Dr., 350.
Creeds, 11.
Crescent and the Cross, 5, 328, 331.
Crete, 463.
Cross, signing with the, 14, 15.
Crowns, 27, 28.
Crucifix, 8.
Crusade, 1st, 289.
———— 2nd, 291.
———— 3rd, 291.
———— 4th, 287, 292—296.
———— 5th, 296.
———— 6th, 297.
———— 7th, 298.
———— 8th, 298.
———— attempt at 9th, 316.
Crusades, 287 *sq.*
———— Character of, 298—300.
Cucusus, 117, 118.
Cyprian, 379.
Cypriots, 129.
Cyprus, 462.
Cyriacus, 183.
Cyrinus, 115.
Cyril of Alexandria, 105, 120 *sq.*, 147, 151, 155.
—— I. of Constantinople, 370.
—— II. ———— 343—345.

Cyril of Jerusalem, 62, 67, 68, 74, 76, 83, 95 *sq.*
—— II. of Kief, 375.
—— Lucar, 335 *sq.*, 413, 414.
—— Terlecky, 412, 413.
—— St., and Methodius, 258—264.
Cyrus of Alexandria, 195, 196.
—— of Constantinople, 207, 229.

Daimbert, 290.
Damas, 91.
Damascus, fall of, 186, 192.
Damasus, Pope, 79, 84, 90, 96.
Daniel of Moscow, 390.
——— the Stylite, 160.
Darboy, Archbishop of Paris, 468.
Dated Creed, 72.
Decretals, the forged, 283, 292, 472.
Decretum de Armeniis, 484.
Dedication Council, 55, 60.
——— Creed, 55, 58, 82.
Demetrius, 320, 323, 324.
Demophilus, 83, 84, 94.
Demosthenes, 87.
Diaconicon, 7.
Diamper, Synod of, 223.
Dianius, 75, 85, 86, 91.
Didymus, 86.
Dioceses, 88.
Diodore of Tarsus, 95, 97, 107, 123.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 45.
——— Bulgaria, 405.
——— Constantinople, 347, 427.
——— Milan, 64, 65.
——— Moscow, 402.
——— the Troitza Lavra, 418, 422.
Dioscorus, 126, 128, 135 *sq.*, 151, 155.
Diospolis, Synod at, 133.
Dir, 356, 357.
Dmitri Donskoi, 374, 379.
——— (son of Ivan IV.), 401.
——— the false, 416, 417.
Döllinger, Dr., 465, 469, 483.
Domitian of Ancyra, 173, 174.
Domnus II. of Antioch, 135, 138—142, 146.
——— III. ——— 177.
Don, battle of the, 379.
Donatists, 31, 32.
Donus, Pope, 200.
Dorotheus, 84, 324.
Druses, 228.
Dyophysites, 209.

Easter, time for observing, 35, 36.
Eastern Syrians, 210, 212, 213, 215.
Ecclesiastical following the civil arrangements, 88, 99.
Ectænia, 7, 15, 17, 435.
Ecthesis, 197, 198.
Edesius, 220.
Edessa, Church of, 180.
——— School at, 210.
Edward I., 298.
Eighteen Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem, 22, 335.
Eleusius of Cyzicus, 59, 74, 82, 95.
Elias, 166.
Elizabeth, Queen of England, 493.
El Tewfik Society, 219.
Enrico Dandolo, 293.
Ephesus, 3rd Œcumenical Council at, 101, 126, 208, 209.
——— Synods at, 109, 160.
Ephraim, Count, 171, 175.
Ephrem Syrus, St., 33, 92, 210
Epigonation, 11
Epimanichia, 10
Epiphanius, 37, 97, 112, 114, 170, 171.
Epiphany, 11, 19.
Epitrachelion, 10.
Etchmiadzen, 225, 227.
Eucharist, the, 14, 18, 23.
Eudocia, 154.
Eudoxia, 111, 112, 115, 116, 118.
Eudoxians, 98.
Eudoxius, 46, 67 *sq.*, 82, 83.
Eugenius, Emperor, 105.
——— IV., Pope, 319—321, 324, 325.
Eulalius of Antioch, 46.
——— Nazianzus, 97.
Eulogius, 133.
Eunomians (*see* Anomœans).
Eunomius of Cyzicus, 68, 69.
——— of Nicomedia, 144.
Euphemia, St., 143, 239.
Euphemius of Constantinople, 162—164.
——— Novgorod, 384.

Euphrasius of Antioch, 170.
Euphrates of Agrippina, 60.
Euphronius, 46.
Eupsychius, 91.
Eusebians, 44 *sq.*
Eusebius of Cæsarea, 31, 33, 34, 38, 45 *sq.*, 86, 91.
——— Constantinople, 56.
——— Dorylæum, 136, 139—142, 145.
——— Emesa, 53.
——— Lydia, 109.
——— Nicomedia, 31—35, 44 *sq.*, 75.
——— Samosata, 92.
——— Vercelli, 64, 78, 80.
Eustathians, 75, 79, 80.
Eustathius of Antioch, 29, 32, 33, 39, 45, 46.
——— Sebaste, 59, 73, 85.
Eustochius, 174, 175.
Euthemius, 273.
Euthymius, 154.
Eutropius, 109—111.
Eutyches, 136—140, 145.
Eutychianism, 166.
Eutychius of Alexandria, 274.
——— Constantinople, 176, 179, 181.
Euzoius, 34.
Evagrius, 105.
Excommunication, 36.
Exucontians, 30.

False Decretals (*see* Forged Decretals).
Fasts, 13.
Fathers of the Sorbonne, 442.
Fatima, 190.
Fatimites, 275, 277.
Favritta, 162, 163.
Felix II., Pope, 65, 67.
—— III., —— 160, 162, 163.
Feodor, St., 358.
Feodor I., Tsar, 401—404, 416.
——— II., —— 416, 429.
Ferrara, Council of, 320—322, 381.
Filioque, 152, 256, 269—271, 284, 301, 307, 308, 322, 323, 481 *sq.*, 497.
Flaccillus, 47, 58.
Flavian I. of Antioch, 96, 105, 108.
Flavian II. of Antioch, 165.
——— of Constantinople, 135—137, 139—144.
Florence, Council of, 322—324.
Forged Decretals, 283, 292, 472.
Formosa, 268, 272.
Foulkes de Villaret, 310.
Francis I., 331.
Frankfort, Council of, 245, 279.
Freeman, Professor, 470.
Frederic II., 297.
French Revolution, 445.
Friuli, Synod of, 284.
Frumentius, 67, 220.
Fulk, 292.
Fuller (*see* Peter).

Gabriel of Constantinople, 347.
——— Servia, 424.
Galich, 370, 371.
Galla, wife of Theodosius, 106.
—— Placidia, daughter of Theodosius, 106, 142.
Gangra, Council of, 40.
Gates, sets of, in Greek Churches, 6, 7.
Gelasius of Cæsarea, 83.
——— Pope, 18, 160—163.
Gennadius of Constantinople, 156, 328.
——— Novgorod, 386.
Genseric, 137.
George I. of Alexandria, 73.
——— II. ——— 195.
——— I. of Constantinople, 200, 201.
——— of Antioch, 204.
——— Canning, 455, 456.
——— of Cappadocia, 66, 67, 77.
——— King of Greece, 458.
——— of Kief, 365.
——— Jerusalem, 247.
——— Laodicea, 47, 58, 69, 74.
Georgia annexed to Russia, 452.
Georgian Church, 450—452.
Gerasimus of Alexandria, 352.
——— Jerusalem, 489.
Germanus I. of Constantinople, 233, 234.
——— III., Patriarch at Nicæa, 300, 304, 306.
Gerontius, Archimandrite, 166.

Gerontius of Moscow, 385, 386.
Gervasius, 296.
Ghengis Khan, 212, 371.
Gideon Balaban, 413.
Gladstone, Mr., 459.
Godfrey de Bouillon, 289, 290.
Golden Horde, 385.
Golovkin, 441, 442.
Gorazd, 265.
Gratian, 90, 91, 102, 104, 106.
Great Entrance, the, 24, 25.
Great schism in the Roman Church, 317, 318.
Greek and Anglican Churches, 349, 350, 481.
Greek Churches, 4—8.
Greek Church, holy days in the, 11, 12, 19.
——————— and Lutheran Reformers, 332.
—— Independence, War of, 454—456.
Gregory of Alexandria, 53, 58, 60.
——————— Amasia, 341.
——————— Antioch, 182.
——————— Constantinople, 454, 455, 459.
——————— Kief, 380.
——— the Illuminator, 224, 225.
——— Bishop of Nazianzus, 75, 86.
——— Nazianzen, 75, 76, 86 *sq.*, 102.
——— of Nyssa, 84 *sq.*, 108.
——— of Syracuse, 254, 256, 267.
——— the Great, Pope, 101, 181—184.
——— II., Pope, 234.
——— III., —— 235, 281.
——— VII., —— 266, 495.
——— IX., —— 296, 300, 473.
——— X., —— 306.
——— XIII., —— 398, 399.
——— XV., —— 20.
——— XVI., —— 450.
Grosteste, 297.
Gustavus Vasa, 410.
Guy de Lusignan, 290, 291.
Gytha, 367.

Hadrianople, battle of, 89, 93.
Hassan, 191.
Hatfield, Council of, 198, 502.
Hegumens, 4, 344.
Helena, mother of Constantine I., 41, 42.
——— wife of Alexander of Lithuania, 387, 388.
——— Glinsky, 389, 390.
Helladius, 95.
Henoticon of Zeno, 161—163.
Henry of Valois, 408.
—— III. of Germany, 279.
Heraclides, 109.
Heraclius, 185—7, 194—197.
Hermogenes of Cæsarea, 34, 56.
——————— Moscow, 417.
Herzegovina, 461, 462.
Hesychasts, 313.
Hilarion, 364, 365.
Hilary, St., of Arles, 471.
——————— Poitiers, 55, 64, 71, 73, 84.
——— Pope, 138, 139, 141.
Holy Governing Synod of Russia, 431 *sq.*
—— Orders, 14, 27.
—— Sepulchre, Church of, 41, 49.
—— Table, 7, 8, 25.
Homœans, 68, 74.
Homoi-ousion, 55, 59, 63, 68—71, 74.
Homo-ousians, 103.
Homo-ousion, 33, 44, 45, 54, 55, 63, 68 *sq.*, 81, 113, 161.
Honorius, Emperor, 106, 134.
——————— I., Pope, 196, 201—203.
——————— III., —— 302.
Hormisdas, Pope, 169.
Hosius, 31—33, 57, 64, 65, 69.
Howley, Archbishop, 487.
Humbert, Cardinal, 282—284, 494.
Hundred Chapters Synod, 393.
Hungary, 331.
Hunyades, 325.
Hymns of the Greek Church, 8, 12, 25.
Hypatia, 124.

Ibas, 140, 148, 174, 177, 178, 210.
Iconoclasm, 248.
Iconoclastic controversy, 230 *sq.*
Icons, 7, 229—233, 235—245, 249—251, 426.
Iconostasis, 7, 26.
Igor, 357.

Ignatius Potsi, 412—414.
——— of Constantinople, 254, 257, 258, 262, 270—272.
——— Cyprus, 417, 418.
Illiberis (Elvira), Council of, 39.
Images, 7, 229 *sq.*
Innocent I., Pope, 133.
——— III., —— 101, 292, 293, 296, 370, 371.
——— IV., —— 297, 371, 375.
Inquisition, 311.
Institutes of Justinian, 180.
Invention of the Cross, 41.
Ionian Islands, 458.
Irene, wife of Constantine V., 236.
——— Feodor I., 401.
——— Leo IV., 239 *sq.*, 248.
Isaac, St., 225.
—— I., Emperor, 285.
—— Angelus II., Emperor, 293.
Isiaslaf I., 365, 366.
——— II., 369.
Isidore of Kief, 321, 322, 324, 326, 328.
——— Moscow, 381.
——— Nitrian monk, 110, 114.
Isidorus Mercator, 248.
Ivan, St., 358.
—— II., of Kief, 367.
—— I., Emperor of Russia, 377.
—— II., ———— 378.
—— III., ———— 382—388.
—— IV. (the Terrible), 378, 389—400, 408.

Jacob Baradai, 215.
—— of Nisibis, 33, 95.
Jacobites, 209, 212, 215, 223, 224.
Jacques du Molay, 311.
Jaffa, 291, 292.
Jagiello, 380.
James I. (of England), 338, 340.
Janissaries, 327, 452, 453.
Jansenists, 347.
Januarius, 17.
Jassy, Synod of, 335, 345, 346.
Jeremias II. of Constantinople, 332—334, 402—404, 411, 412.
——— III. ———— 17, 435.
Jeremy Collier, 353.
Jerome, St., 62, 71, 75, 79, 84, 93, 95, 109, 112, 113, 120—122.
Jerusalem, Consecration of St. George's Church at, 488.
——— fall of, 186, 192, 196, 288, 291, 297.
——— kings of, 290.
——— Mother of all Churches, 99.
——— revival of Anglican bishopric at, 487.
——— Synod at, 324.
——— taken by Crusaders, 290.
Jesuits, 219, 221, 227, 340 *sq.*, 408 *sq.*, 446.
—— in Poland, 408.
Jews, 76, 84, 233.
Joachim of Antioch, 402.
——— Jerusalem, 324.
——— Moscow, 429.
Joannicus III., 347.
Joasaph I., Patriarch of Moscow, 419.
——— II., ———— 429.
Job, first Patriarch of Moscow, 403, 404.
John, St., 36.
—— V. (the Almoner), 186.
—— of Antioch, 123—131, 134, 210.
—— IV., ———, 289, 290.
—— Arcaph, 47, 48, 50, 51.
—— Ascunages, 181.
—— of Austria, 331.
—— Beccus or Veccus, 306—308.
—— Camateros, 294, 295, 300.
—— Cantacuzene, 314, 315.
—— Claude, 347.
—— VI. of Constantinople, 229.
—— X. ———— 292.
—— Damascene, St., 234, 235.
———— writings of, 483.
—— King of England, 495.
—— IV., the Faster, 181—183.
—— VII., the Grammarian, 250, 251.
—— Huss, 406.
—— II., of Jerusalem, 112—114.
—— III., ———— 166.
—— of Persia and Great India, 33.
—— Philoponus, 181.
—— of Ravenna, 184.

John Scholasticus, 179—181.
—— III., King of Sweden, 409, 410
—— III., Emperor, 300.
—— IV., ——— 301.
—— V., ——— 314—316.
—— VI., ——— 319—325.
—— I., Pope, 170.
—— VI., —— 207.
—— VII., —— 207.
—— VIII., —— 264, 272.
—— XI., —— 274.
—— XII., —— 471.
—— XIII., —— 263.
—— XXII., —— 312.
Jonah of Moscow, 382.
Josaphat Bulgak, 447, 448.
Joseph I. of Constantinople, 304, 306, 308.
——— II. ——————— 321, 323.
——— of Lithuania, 449.
——— Moscow, 420.
——— Siemasko of Polotsk, 448.
——— of Samos, 350.
Jovian, 82.
Judicatum, 176.
Julian (the Apostate), 75—77, 80, 82.
——— Cæsarini, 320, 322, 325.
——— Emperor, 85, 91.
——— of Antioch, 156.
——— Cos, 152.
——— Halicarnassus, 165, 167.
Julius of Puteoli, 138, 141.
——— I., Pope, 53, 54.
——— II., —— 388.
——— III., —— 212, 213.
Jurisdiction of bishops, 99.
Justin I., 167, 169, 170.
——— II., 180.
Justina, 81, 90, 105.
Justinian I., 171—179.
——— II., 204, 207.
Juvenal, 120, 123, 135 *sq.*, 154, 156, 165.

Kaloirs, 4.
Kanardji, Treaty of, 444, 445, 453, 456, 461.
Kazan, Metropolitan see established at, 393, 394.
Kennobin (Cœnobium), convent of, 228.
Kephalaia, the, 195, 196.
Khazars, 258, 259.
Kief, 355—357, 362 *sq.*, 374.
King, Dr., 22.
Kamel, 297.
Ken, Bishop, 351.
Knights Hospitallers, 290, 297, 310, 331.
——— of the Sword, 371.
——— Templars, 290, 292, 297, 310, 311.
Koran, 189.
Kossova, battle of, 316.
Kromieskniks, 396.
Kumos, 221.
Kurdish massacres, 213, 214.
Kurds, 214, 215.

Ladislaus of Hungary, 325.
——— IV. of Poland, 414.
Lambeth Conferences, 466, 477, 478.
Lampsacus, Council at, 82.
Lateran Council, 1st, 198.
——— ——— 4th, 20, 101, 296.
Latin Patriarchs, 302.
Latrocinium, Council, 101, 138, 145—147.
Laud, Archbishop, 340, 492.
Lavras, 438.
Le Maistre, Count, 465, 466.
Lent, 12, 13, 19, 20.
Leo I., Emperor, 155—157.
—— III., ——— 230—235.
—— IV., ——— 239.
—— V., ——— 249.
—— VI., ——— 272, 273.
—— I., Pope, 19, 101, 137, 138, 141, 143, 152.
—— II., Pope, 203.
—— III., —— 246, 247, 256.
—— IX., —— 280, 284.
Leontius of Antioch, 33, 37, 60, 67, 68.
——— —— Cæsarea, 225.
——— —— Kief, 281, 362, 365.
Leopold of Austria, 291.
Lepanto, battle of, 331.
Le Roy Beaulieu, M., 497.
Libanius, 104, 107, 108.
Liberius of Berœa, 70, 71.
——— Pope, 63—65.

Licinius, 31.
Lithuanian College of White Russia, 449.
Little Entrance, the, 24, 25.
Liturgies, 12, 19, 20.
Liverpool, Consecration of Greek Church at, 458, 474.
Logos, 98, 146.
Lombards, 238.
London, Treaty of, 456.
Louis the German, 260.
——— IX. of France, 297, 298.
——— XIV. ——— 350.
Lowe, Sir Thomas, 339—341.
Lucar, *see* Cyril.
Lucentius, 150.
Lucian, St., of Antioch, 123.
Lucianists, 34.
Lucifer of Cagliari, 64, 78—80.
Luciferians, 80.
Lucius, 78, 91, 94.
Ludmila, 262.
Lycurgus, Archbishop, 455, 458, 459, 474.
Lyons, Councils at, 306, 311.

Macarius of Antioch, 200—202.
——— III. of Antioch, 424, 427.
——— Jerusalem, 9, 29, 31, 32, 38, 41.
——— Moscow, 391, 393, 394.
Macedonians, 89.
Macedonius of Antioch, 197—199.
——— I. of Constantinople, 56, 57, 73, 74, 94.
——— II. ——— 164.
Macrina, St., 85.
Macrostich, the, 60, 63.
Magnentius, 61.
Magyars, 266.
Mahmoud II., 453.
Mahomet, 187—190.
——— II. (Sultan), 326, 328—330, 335, 336.
Mahometanism, 187—191.
Mahometans, 218, 226, 231.
Malik Shah, 288.
Malta, Knights of, 331.
Mamelukes, 226.
Mangou Temir, 376.
Manichæism, 169.
Manning, Cardinal, 472, 496.
Manuel II., 319.
Manzikert, battle of, 288.
Maphrian, 216.
Marcellians, 98.
Marcellus, 33, 47, 50 *sq.*, 62.
Marcian, Emperor, 142, 143, 146, 151, 152, 155.
——— of Lampsacus, 95.
Mar Gabriel, 214.
Mari, St., 210.
Marinus I., Pope, 272.
Maris of Chalcedon, 33, 34, 49.
——— Hardascir, 210, 211.
Mark of Ephesus, 321—324.
Maro, St., 227.
Maronites, 209, 227.
Marriage of clergy, 14, 27, 28, 40, 205.
Mar Shimun, 213.
Martin Crusius, 332, 333.
——— I., Pope, 198, 199.
——— IV., ——— 308.
——— V., ——— 318, 319.
Martyrius of Antioch, 156.
——— Jerusalem, 166.
Mar Yunan, 214.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day, 408.
Masserah, 489, 490.
Masson, Mr., Apology for the Greek Church, 20.
Mattran, 213.
Maurice, Emperor, 182—184.
Maximian, 130.
Maximin, 50, 58.
Maximus of Antioch, 141, 143, 147, 156.
——— Constantinople, 95, 96.
——— the Cynic, 93, 94, 98, 100.
——— Emperor, 104, 105.
——— of Jerusalem, 47, 61, 62.
——— Kief and Vladimir, 376.
——— monk of Mount Athos, 389, 390.
——— St., 199.
Mecca, 189, 190.
Medina, 189—192.
Melancthon, 332.
Meletian Schism, 36, 42.
Meletians, 48, 78.
Meletius of Alexandria, 338.

Meletius of Antioch, 75, 78, 79. 91, 95, 96, 107, 108, 471.
Meletius Syriga of Constantinople, 346.
——— bishop in Egypt, 37.
——— of Vladimir, 412.
Memnon, 126, 128, 130.
Memorial, concerning the Nicene Creed, 503.
Menexes, Alexis di, 223.
Mennas, 171, 176.
Merozanes, bishop of Armenia, 224.
Mesrob, St., 225.
Metaxa, 341, 391.
Methodius, 251, 258—266.
Metrophanes II., 324.
——— III., 332, 334.
——— Critopulos, 339.
——— St., of Vironege, 431.
Metropolitans, 88.
——— of Kief, 364.
Michael Autorianus of Constantinople, 300.
——— Cerularius of Constantinople, 278—286.
——— Confessor to Dmitri, 379.
——— of Kief, 362.
——— Ragoza, 412—414.
——— I. (Rhangabe), 249.
——— II. (Balbus), 249, 250.
——— III. (the Drunkard), 251, 255 *sq.*, 266—269.
——— IV., 278.
——— VI., 285.
——— Palæologus, 301—308.
——— Tsar, 418, 419.
Mieczyslav, I., 263.
——— II., 264.
Milan, Council at, 64.
Milevum, Council at, 133.
Minin, 418.
Mistislaf, 369.
Moawiyah, 191, 194.
Model of Faith, 198.
Modestus of Jerusalem, 186, 187.
Mogila, *see* Peter.
Moldavia, 445, 456, 461.
Monasticism, 238, 239.
Mongols, 371—375.
Monophysites, 154 *sq.*, 175, 178, 195, 208, 209, 215, 220, 226.
Monothelitism, 195—197, 200, 201, 227, 228.
Montanists, 233.
Montenegro, 463.
Moors, 230.
Moravia, 259—266.
Morosini, Thomaso, 295, 296.
Morton, Bishop of Durham, 349.
Moscow, 369, 377.
——— fire at, 392.
——— raised into a Patriarchate, 401—406.
——— Patriarchate of abolished, 430—432.
——— Synods at, 422, 427.
——— taken by the Mongols, 379.
——— the Third Rome, 383.
Moses, bishop of the Saracens, 190.
Moslem, 189.
Mosques, Churches converted into, 328, 329.
Mount Athos, 4, 313.
——— Sion, 216.
Mouravief, M., 351.
Murad I., 315, 316.
—— II., 320, 325.
—— III., 402, 405.
—— IV., 344.
Murtzuphlus, 294, 295.
Muscovites, 378.
Music in Greek Churches, 8.
Mysteries or Sacraments, 13, 14.

Napoleon I., 218.
Narses, 211.
Narthex, 6.
National schools in Russia, 393.
——— Synod of the Kingdom of Greece, 457.
Navarino, Battle of, 456.
Nave, 6, 25.
Nectarius of Constantinople, 96, 97, 102, 103, 107, 109.
——— Jerusalem, 346, 427.
——— Pentapolis, 491.
Neophytus, 340.
Neo-Platonism, 108.
Nestor, 356.
Nestorianism, 136, 137, 140 *sq.*, 154, 208.
Nestorians, 208—211, 222.

Nestorius, 122—131, 134, 147, 210, 211.
Neva, battle of, 374.
Newman, Cardinal, 110.
New Rome, 100, 106.
Nicæa, 1st Œcumenical Council of, 32—46, 99.
—— 2nd ————————————, 241 *sq.*
—— Conference at, 301.
Nicene Creed, 11, 15, 34, 45, 55, 58, 68, 90 *sq.*, 126 *sq.*, 144, 145, 497 *sq.*
Nicephorus I. of Constantinople, 241, 248, 249, 251.
———— II. ———————— 301.
———— Phocas, 276.
———— Archimandrite of Pechersky Monastery, 413, 414.
———— III., Emperor, 367.
Nicetas of Constantinople, 239, 240.
———— Kief, 368.
———— (Strigolnik), 429.
Nicolas I. of Constantinople, 273, 274.
———— I., Pope, 253, 256—258, 266—268, 472.
—— III., —— 308.
—— V., —— 326.
—— I., Tsar, 447, 456.
Nicon, 419—430, 432.
Nicopolis, battle of, 316.
Nikè-Rimini Creed, 72, 74, 75, 82, 85, 86.
Nikita Romanof, 401.
Nina, St., 451.
Niphont, 368, 369.
Nisibis, school of, 211.
Non-jurors and the Eastern Patriarchs, 351—353.
———————— Russian Church, 440—442.
Nonna, St., 86.
Novatians, 38, 103.
Novels of Justinian, 88, 180.
Novgorod, 355, 356, 363, 384, 397, 405.
Nubia, 220
Nymphæum, Conference at, 502.

Oak, Council of the, 115—117.
Ober-Prokuror, 435.
Oblations, 24.
Odoacer, 158, 159.
Œcumenical Councils, 101, 184, 318.
———— Patriarchs of Constantinople, 172, 182.
Oil, anointing with, 15, 16.
Old Catholics, 480 *sq.*
Old Rome, 106, 107.
Oleg, 357.
Olga, 357, 358.
Omar, 189, 190, 192.
—— Mosque of, 41.
Ommyad dynasty, 191.
Omophorion, 10, 11.
Onesiphorus, 411.
Opreechniks, 396—398.
Orarion, 11.
Ordination, 484.
Organs, 426.
Origen, works of, 112—114, 174.
Origenism, 112—114.
Origenists, 173, 174.
Orkhan, 310, 314, 327.
Orosius, 133.
Orthodox Confession of Peter Mogila, 346.
Osiander, 333.
Ostrog, 413.
Othman, 190, 194, 309.
Otho, 457.
Otto I., 263.
—— III., 263.
Ottoman Turks, 309.
Ousia, 69, 72.
Oxford, Greek Students at, 350, 351.

Pagans, 84.
Paganism, 76 *sq.*, 90, 103—105, 108.
Paisius of Alexandria, 427.
———— Constantinople, 423, 427.
———— Jerusalem, 349, 420.
Palæologi, 303.
Palladius, 162, 165.
Palmer, Rev. W., 475.
Pandects of Justinian, 180.
Papal Infallibility, 467, 468—471.
Paphnutius, 33, 40.
Paranymph, 27.
Parthemius I., 335, 345.
———— II., 346.
———— III., 346.
———— IV., 347.

Paschal II., Pope, 18.
Paschasinus, 143, 144, 150.
Paten, 24, 25.
Patriarchal Sees, 1, 3.
Patriarchs of Constantinople under the Sultan, 336, 337.
Patrimony of Peter, 238, 246, 470.
Patrophilus, 49, 62, 73.
Paul I. of Antioch, 123.
—— II. ———— 170.
—— I. of Constantinople, 52, 54, 56, 197—199.
—— III. ———— 204.
—— IV. ———— 240.
—— of Heraclea, 115.
—— II., Pope, 382, 383.
—— IV., —— 407, 493.
Paulianists, 39.
Paulinus of Antioch, 33, 46, 79, 80, 96, 105.
———— Aquileia, 284.
———— Treves, 64.
Pechersky Monastery, 345, 363, 365.
Pelagianism, 131—134, 137.
Pelagius, 132.
———— I., Pope, 174, 178.
———— II., —— 182.
Penance, 14, 27, 38.
Peter of Altino, 168.
—— I. of Alexandria, 29.
—— II. ———— 84, 90, 91, 93, 94.
—— Melchite Patriarch of Alexandria, 193, 204.
— Fuller, 129, 156, 159—161.
—— the Hermit, 288—289.
—— the Great, 227, 352, 431 *sq.*, 442.
—— of Jerusalem, 173.
—— Lombard, 14.
—— Mogila, 19—22, 26, 345, 414.
—— Mongus, 160—162.
—— II., Vladika of Montenegro, 463.
—— St., at Rome, 35.
—— of Sebaste, 85, 95.
—— Skarga, 338, 409, 412.
—— of Vladimir and Moscow, 376, 377.
Petersburg, foundation of, 432.
Petrarch, 310.
Phænolion, 10.
Phanariots, 336.
Philadelphia, 309, 310.
Philagrius, 53.
Philaret, 21, 23, 417—419.
Philip, St. (Apostle), 36.
———— of Moscow, 395—397.
———— Augustus of France, 291.
———— le Bel of France, 311, 312.
Philippicus, 229.
Philippopolis, 57.
Philogonius, 31.
Philotheus, 324.
Phocas, 184, 185.
Photinians, 98.
Photinus, 63.
Photius, 253 *sq.*, 266—272, 356, 379, 380.
Piacenza, Council of, 289.
Pimen, of the Pechersky monastery, 379.
———— of Novgorod, 398.
Pisa, Council of, 318.
Piscina, 8.
Pistus of Alexandria, 30, 34, 53.
Pipin the Little, 238.
Pitirim, 429.
Pius IV., Pope, 408, 494.
—— V., —— 494.
Placilla, 90.
Plato, 13, 21, 22.
—— Orthodox doctrine of, 23.
Pneumatomachi, 89, 98.
Poland, conversion of, 263, 387, 406 *sq.*, 446, 447.
Politian, 241.
Polotsk, 447, 448.
Polycarp, St., 35, 36.
Polycrates, 36.
Polyeuktes, 275, 276.
Porphyry, 117, 118.
Possevin, 338, 399, 409.
Potamon, 48.
Potsi (*see* Ignatius).
Pratasof, Count, 448, 449, 497.
Praylius of Jerusalem, 120, 133.
Precedence of Rome, 149.
———— sees, 99, 101, 205.
Prefectures, 88.
Presanctified, Liturgy of the, 20.
Prester John, 221.
Pro-Anaphora, 23, 25.
Proclus, 122, 131, 134.

Prosphers, 23, 24, 26, 426.
Proterius, 155, 156.
Protestant, a word not used in Anglican services, 2.
Protestants, origin of word, 492.
Prothesis, 7, 8, 23—25.
Pskof, 398.
Pulcheria, 120, 135, 141, 142, 146, 152, 155.
Purgatory, 322, 348.
Pusey, Dr., 484, 485.
Pyrrhus, 197, 199.
Pyx, 8.

Quarto-decimans, 35, 128.
Quinsext, or Trullan Council, 204.

Rabulas, 128, 210.
Ragoza (*see* Michael).
Rank of principal sees, 99, 101, 205.
Raskol (dissent), 393.
Raskolniks, 440.
Re-baptizing converts, 17.
Reginus, 129.
Relics, 244.
Renatus, 138.
Reparatus, 176.
Restitutus, 71.
Re-union, 209, 300, 305 *sq.*, 319 *sq.*, 344, 459, 464 *sq.*, 481 *sq.*
Rhodes taken by Turks, 331.
Ricaud, Sir Paul, 309, 349.
Richard, Earl of Cornwall, 297.
Rimini, Council at, 71.
Roderic, 230.
Rodvald, 266.
Roman, 370.
Romania, Emperors of, 302.
Romanofs, the, 416, 417.
Romanus I., 273.
——— II., 275.
——— III., 278.
——— IV., 288.
Rome, Council at, 54.
——— jurisdiction of Popes of, 59.
——— taking of by Belisarius, 172.
Rostof, 405.
Roumania, 461.
Rouski, 414.
Rufinus, the historian, 112, 113, 115, 122, 497.
——— Syrian, 131.
Russia, conversion of, 355—361.
——— and Constantinople, 356, 357.
——— education in, 372.
——— monasteries in, 372, 373.
Russian and Anglican Churches, 443.
——— Church, and Rome, 365—367.
——— Service-Books, 389, 422—424, 428.
Russkaya Pravda, 363.
Ruric, 356.

Sabas, St., 166, 173, 235.
Sabellianism, 45, 73, 98.
Sabinians, 182.
Saccos, 11.
Sacraments, 13, 14.
Saints' days, 13.
Saladin, 291, 292.
Salisbury, Bishop of, 478, 479.
Sallustius, 166.
Salome, 388, 389.
Samuel, Tsar of Bulgaria, 277.
Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, 351.
San Stephano, Treaty of, 462.
Saracens, 187 *sq.*, 230, 231, 275—277.
Sarai, 374—376, 385.
Sardica, Council of, 57—59.
Sassanidæ, 191, 225.
Satis Cognitum (Encyclical), 473.
Saturninus, 63, 64.
Savonarola, 389.
Seamless robe of Christ, finding of the, 185.
Secular clergy, 4.
Secundus, 30, 33—35, 53, 57—63.
Seleucia, Councils at, 72, 212.
Selim I., 330.
—— II., 331.
—— III., 453.
Seljuk, 287.
Seljuks, 287, 288, 309.
Semi-Arians, 43, 55, 59, 62, 68 *sq.*, 82, 89, 98.
Serapion, 110.
Serenus, 232.
Sergius of Constantinople, 195—198, 202.
——— I., Pope, 206.
——— III., —— 273, 274.

Sergius of the Troitza, 378, 379.
Servia, 315, 316, 325, 452, 453.
Service-books, 12, 389, 422—424, 428.
Seven Churches, the, of Asia, 309.
Severa, 81.
Severus of Aquileia, 184.
——— Emperor, 164 *sq.*, 215.
Shiites, 190, 191.
Sicilian Vespers, the, 308.
Sigismond of Hungary, 316, 318.
——— I. of Poland, 388, 407.
——— II. ——— 407, 408.
——— III. ——— 406 *sq.*, 418.
Silvanus, 67.
Silverius, Pope, 172.
Silvester of Novgorod, 393.
——— Rome, 32.
——— Pope, 51.
Simeon of Bulgaria, 274, 277.
——— Jerusalem, 288.
——— Moscow, 386.
——— Stylites, 156.
Simony, 244.
Simplicius, Pope, 158, 160, 162, 173.
Siricius, ——— 113.
Sirmium, Synods of, 63, 69, 70.
Sisinnius, 122, 134.
Sixtus IV., Pope, 330.
Slavs, conversion of the, 258—266.
Smirnof, Very Rev. E., 486.
Smith, Dr., 20, 349.
Smyrna, Church of, 309.
Sobor, 435.
Soleas, 7.
Solomon I., 331.
Sonnites, 190, 191.
Sophia's, St., at Constantinople, 74, 117, 180.
Sophronius, 186, 192, 195, 196.
Spires, Diet of, 491.
Spiridon, 33, 40.
Spiritual Regulation, the, 434.
Stanislaus Hosen, 408.
Staroviertsi, 428, 440.
Stauropegias, 438.
Staurophaneia, 41.
Stephen of Antioch, 34, 58, 60.
——— Batory, 399, 408, 409.
——— of Constantinople, 274.
——— Dor, 196—198.
——— Dushan, 315.
Stephen Javorsky, 433.
——— III., Pope, 238.
——— IX., ——— 282.
Sticharion, 10, 11.
Strigolniks, 385, 386, 429.
Sulpitius Severus, 62.
Supremacy of Patriarch of Constantinople, 2.
——— question of between Rome and Constantinople, 282, 285.
Sutri, Council of, 279.
Suzdal, 369, 370.
Sviatislaf, 277, 357, 358.
Sviatopolk, 259, 262, 264, 265, 362.
Symmachus, Pope, 168, 169.
Synod of Bethlehem, 21.
Syria, 191, 192.
Syrianus, Duke, 56.
Syropulus, 321.

Tall Brothers, the, 114, 115.
Tarasius, 240—242.
Temple of Fortune at Cæsarea, 91.
Terlecky (*see* Cyril).
Thaddæus, St., 210, 224.
Thalaia, 160.
Thebaid, Monks of the, 66.
Theodora, daughter of Basil II., 378.
——— wife of Justinian, 171, 172.
——— ———Theophilus, 249, 250, 251.
Theodore of Antioch, 241.
——— Ascidas, 173—175.
——— Cupharas, 261, 262.
——— Archbishop of Canterbury, 199, 201.
——— of Heraclea, 58.
——— Lascaris, 294, 299—301.
——— of Mopsuestia, 107, 122, 123, 134, 174, 177, 210.
——— I., of Constantinople, 200—202.
——— I., Pope, 197.
——— Studita, 250, 251.
——— Memorial Press, 479.
Theodoret of Cyrus, 90, 125 *sq.*, 174, 177.
Theodoric the Great, King of Italy, 159, 166, 170.

Theodosians, 195.
Theodosius I., Emperor, 90, 94, 95, 102 *sq.*
——— II., ——— 120 *sq.*, 142.
——— of Jerusalem, 155.
——— St., of Pechersky Monastery, 365.
Theodotus of Antioch, 120, 123.
——— Constantinople, 249.
Theognis, 33—35, 49.
Theognostes, 377, 378.
Theoleptus of Constantinople, 389, 402.
Theonas of Marmarica, 30, 33, 34.
Theopaschites, 156.
Theopemptus, 364.
Theophanes of Antioch, 202.
——— Pskof, 434.
Theophano, wife of Otto II., 275.
——— Romanus II., 275, 276.
Theophilus of Alexandria, 104, 105, 110, 112—117.
——— Bulgaria, 270.
——— Emperor, 249, 250.
——— Bishop of the Goths, 33.
——— of Novgorod, 384.
Theophylact, 274, 275.
Theopolis, 171.
Theotokos, 124, 125, 146, 147.
Thirty-nine Articles, the, 493, 494.
Thomas, brother of Constantine XI., 326.
——— Monk of Palestine, 241.
——— of Constantinople, 200.
——— St., 222.
Thorn, murder of Protestants at, 446.
Three Chapters, controversy of, 174—178.
Tiberius, 181, 207.
Timothy of Alexandria, 94—96, 98, 100, 105.
——— Ælurus of Alexandria, 157, 160.
——— III., ——— 165.
——— of Constantinople, 165, 340.
——— Salophaciolus, 156, 157, 160.
Timour, or Tamerlane, 212, 317.
Tiridates III., 224
Togrel Beg, 287.
Toledo, Councils of, 282, 284, 501
Tome of Athanasius, 79.
——— Leo, 137, 145.
Tovin, 225, 226.
Translation of the Bible by St Jerome, 120.
——— of Bishops and Clergy, 38, 39.
Transubstantiation, 22, 347, 348.
Travancore, 224.
Trent, Council of, 19.
Treves, 50.
Trisagion, 156.
Tritheism, heresy, 181.
Troilus of Constantia, 129.
Troitza Monastery, 378.
Trullan Council (1st), 201, 202.
——— (Quinsext), 204—207, 232.
Tryphon, 274.
Tubingen Divines, 333—335.
Turkey, 444, 445, 452, 461.
Turks, 325 *sq.*, 330, 402, 403.
Tyre, Council of, 47.

Ukraine, Church of the, 414.
Ulphilas, 35, 74, 107, 112.
Unction with Chrism, 14, 16—18, 100, 101.
——— Oil, 14, 28.
Unia, the, 338, 340, 345, 411, 413—415.
Uniat Chaldæans, 213.
——— Church, 219.
Uniats, 224, 415, 446—448.
——— re-united with the Orthodox Church, 449, 450.
——— Armenians, 227, 228.
Urban II., Pope, 18, 288, 289.
——— IV., ——— 305.
——— VI., ——— 315, 317.
Urmi, 214.
Ursacius, 35, 47, 49, 58, 61, 63, 69, 72.

Vagarshabad, Synod of, 226, 452
Valens (Emperor), 35, 49, 61, 63, 69, 71, 72, 81 *sq.*, 190.
——— of Mursa, 47, 58.
Valentinian I., 81, 90.
——— ——— II., 90, 105.

Valentinian III., 106, 126, 142, 148.
Varna, Battle of, 325.
Vatatzes, 300, 301, 502.
Veccus, 306, 308, 376.
Vedrocka, Battle of, 388.
Vestal Virgins, 104.
Vestments, 9—11.
Victor, 36.
Vigilius, Pope, 171—177.
Vincent of Capua, 60, 63.
——— Lerins, 63.
Vitalian, General, 166, 167, 169.
——— Pope, 199, 201.
Vitovt, 380.
Vizier, 336, 337, 340—342.
Vladimir I., 358—362.
——— II., 367, 368.
——— 376, 377.
Volkerwanderung, the, 106.
Vratislaf, 259, 260, 264.

Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 353, 354.
Wallace, Mr. Mackenzie, 497.
Wallachia, 325, 445, 456, 461.
Wenceslaus, 262.
Western Syrians, 210.
Wilfrid of York, 201.
William I. of England, 495.
Woodroffe, Dr., 350.
Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, 459.

Xenaias, or Philoxenus, 165, 167, 216.
Xeres, Battle of, 230.

Yaroslaf I., 362, 363.
——— II., 374.
Yury Dolgorouky, 360.
—— of Kief, 365, 366.

Zacharias of Anagni, 266, 267.
——— Jerusalem, 185, 186, 187.
Zara, 293.
Zeid, 189.
Zeno, 156 *sq.*, 211.
Zimisces, John, 274.
Zoe, mother of Constantine VII., 273.
—— wife of Constantine IX., 278, 279.
——— Ivan III., 282, 383, 387, 388.
Zoilus, 175, 176.
Zoroaster, 225.
Zosimus of Moscow, 385, 386.
——— Pope, 133, 134.

ON THE SUMMARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

Printed by James Parker and Co., Crown Yard, Oxford.

37651 281.9Q
Hore, A.H. H78S

Students History of the
Greek Church

37651 281.9Q
H78S